

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
OCTOBER, 1896.

ARTICLE I.

DE BAPTISMO—AUGSBURG CONFESSION, ART. IX.

THE HOLMAN LECTURE, DELIVERED JUNE, 1896, IN THE THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

BY REV. R. W. HUFFORD, D. D.

"Concerning Baptism, our churches teach that it is necessary to salvation; that through baptism the grace of God is offered. And that children are to be baptized, who being by baptism offered to God are received into his favor. Therefore we reject the doctrines of the Anabaptists, who reject the baptism of children."

The first essential of a Christian confession is that it conform to the teachings of the word of God. If it fails in this, it utterly fails. Such a confession is not intended to set forth the teachings of tradition, or the deductions of philosophy—even though that philosophy be Christian—but the plain teachings of the Bible.

Profoundly true is the declaration of Augustine, that "It matters not what I say, what you say or what he says, but, *what saith the Lord*." There is no dissent among us to these words of the great bishop of Hippo, who, by a thousand years, simply anticipated the confessional position of Protestantism.

The distinguished author of the "Creeds of Christendom," has fairly and clearly stated this position as follows: "In the Protestant system the authority of symbols, as of all human compositions, is relative and limited. It is not coördinate with, but always subordinate to, the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. The value of creeds depends upon the measure of their agreement with the Scriptures."*

This truth fought for its life, in the person of Luther, at the Diet at Worms, and bodied forth the fruits of its victory at the Diet at Augsburg, in the Confession submitted there. The great principle of the Reformation, the very genius of the evangelical movement of the sixteenth century irrevocably binds our communion to its unqualified acceptance.

The true Lutheran, whatever else he may hold, must enthrone the unchangeable divine word as supreme over all.

We try our creeds by our Bible, not our Bible by our creeds. Recognizing this infallible test, the student of the Augsburg Confession approaches that venerable symbol, profoundly grateful that in this as in all things human, there is a higher court, a court of final appeal. And, if in the examination of the Confession of his Church, he comes to the conclusion that it is a most admirable and faithful setting forth of the great doctrines of the divine word, it does not necessarily follow that his judgment is warped by his ecclesiastical relations, but the rather it may be only another proof, however small, that the men whom God raised up for the work of the Church in the crisis period of its later history, knew their Bible well, and were guided by the Holy Spirit.

The Œcumenical Creeds, namely, the Apostolic, the Nicene and the Athanasian, contain no deliverance on Baptism, with the exception that the Nicene has the words, "I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. The Augustana is therefore the first of the great symbols of the Church, ancient or modern, to make a comprehensive statement concerning the place of baptism in the system of Christian doctrine and life.

Three affirmations are made in this article, viz.: That bap-

tism is necessary, that grace is offered through baptism, and that children are to be baptized. We shall consider these in their order.

I. THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM.

"Our churches teach that it is necessary to salvation."

This doctrine rests on the plain command of Jesus Christ, our Lord, and is supported by the undeviating practice of his inspired apostles.

The last words of Jesus to his apostles, as recorded in the first Gospel, giving them their great commission, a commission beside which the highest mandates of earthly kings are dwarfed into insignificance, reads: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 28 : 19, R. V.

There should never have been, there should never be, any doubt as to the meaning and binding obligation of this command. To one who holds that the words of Scripture are to be interpreted according to the laws of language and their historic connection, there is but one possible conclusion, namely, that of the Confession: "Baptism is necessary."

It may be syllogistically stated thus:

What the Lord has commanded is necessary.

The Lord has commanded Baptism,

Therefore, Baptism is necessary.

That the inspired apostles understood this command of Christ in its most natural sense is beyond question. On the great day of Pentecost at Jerusalem, when three thousand accepted the risen and ascended Lord as their Saviour, the sign and seal of that infinitely significant and solemn act, was the speedily administered sacrament of holy baptism. Acts 2 : 41. Farther on in the history of the apostolic Church we find no record of any departure from this rule. Converts, alike from Judaism, Samaritanism and heathenism, were baptized. Vide Acts 8 : 12, 36; 9 : 18; 10 : 48; 16 : 15, 33.

It probably did not enter into the minds of those first preachers of the Church to discuss many question that have risen in

later times as to the full significance of this sacrament. It was enough that the Lord had said, "Preach the Gospel and baptize those who accept it." It was theirs to obey. In this they did not err. The confessors at Augsburg, with a singleness of purpose never surpassed, in their effort to restore to their rightful place the teachings of the Gospel, could say concerning baptism nothing less than this: "It is necessary."

The word necessary, however, is not to be understood as synonymous with essential. The failure to recognize this truth has been the cause of considerable misunderstanding and not a little discussion. It is unfortunate that learned, as well as unlearned men, will sometimes read into words a meaning that does not belong to them, particularly when they are dealing with the confession of a sister denomination.

It would be difficult, very likely impossible, to find a theologian in the Lutheran Church who would be willing to accept this article if the word essential were substituted for the word necessary. The change of a single word would destroy the doctrinal integrity of the article.

Hollazius says: "Baptism is necessary, through the necessity of obeying a divine command and of using an appointed means: through an ordinate and not an absolute necessity, inasmuch as we believe that the children of Christians dying without baptism are saved. (Schmid's Dogm., p. 570).

Dr. C. P. Krauth, who is not open to the charge of holding lax views of the sacraments, and who has placed the Church under lasting obligations for the results of his exhaustive study of the whole subject, says: "Our Church regards baptism not as *essential* in its proper sense, but as necessary. That which is properly 'essential' allows of no degree of limitation, but that which is 'necessary' may be so in various degrees and with manifold limitations. The Augsburg Confession says, not that baptism is essential, but simply that it is necessary, to which the Latin, not to show the degree of necessity but merely its object, adds, 'to salvation.'"

"In later editions of the Confession," continues Dr. Krauth, "Melancthon, to remove the possibility of misconstruction, ad-

ded a few words to the ninth article so that it reads: 'Of baptism they teach that it is necessary to salvation, 'as a ceremony instituted of Christ.' And with such mild expression, even those who were most remote from the Melanchthonian spirit were satisfied. Finally, says Dr. Krauth, the Church never has held, but has always repudiated, the idea that baptism is unconditionally essential or necessary to salvation. She has declared that not the deprivation of baptism, but the contempt of it condemns a man." (Cons. Ref., pp. 562, 563).

God has provided means. His plain command is to use the means provided. It is not for man to provide other means or to ask whether other means could not be provided, or whether it is not safe to omit a part of the provided means. That is not "the interrogation of a good conscience." The interrogation of a good conscience is, "What does our Lord and Master tell us to do?" The "answer" of a good conscience, is, prompt, unquestioning and cheerful obedience.

II. THE BENEFITS OF BAPTISM.

"Through baptism the grace of God is offered."

Grace may be defined as that divine operation by which one becomes a child of God and is built up in the Christian life.

God is the author and source of grace. Man is its object. The divine purpose in the bestowment of grace is the salvation of the soul. Grace bestowed is the Gospel applied. Baptism, as we have seen, is by command of the Lord. Its author is the author of grace. It therefore follows that baptism, because commanded of the Lord, is not an empty ceremony. There are no empty ceremonies commanded of the Lord, nor can there be. Baptism has a purpose. That purpose, worthy of the wisdom and character of its author, is simply stated in the words of the Confession: "Through baptism the grace of God is offered," *i. e.* baptism is a means of grace. God uses baptism in that divine operation by which the sinner becomes a child of God and is developed in the Christian life.

That baptism is a means of grace follows primarily from the fact that baptism is obedience to a divine command. The ar-

gument shapes itself into another syllogism. Obedience to any and every divine command is a means of grace. Baptism is obedience to a divine command. Therefore baptism is a means of grace. Is the major premise in this reasoning questioned—*i. e.*, that obedience to any and every divine command is a means of grace? It is maintained that the words and spirit of the Bible teach it, and the experience of God's people confirms it. "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock. Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not, I will liken him unto a foolish man who built his house upon the sand." Matt. 7 : 24. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him." John 14 : 21. Is it urged that faith has no place in this reasoning?

There is no true obedience without faith, nor will faith long exist without obedience, where obedience is possible. The Scriptures are a means of offered grace everywhere and always, but to him who is a hearer and not a doer of the word, they become a savor of death unto death, and not a savor of life unto life. Obedience to God's commands has ever been and ever will be the channel of divine grace. It is therefore safely affirmed that holy baptism, because commanded of the Lord, is a means of grace. The confessors wisely limited the statement to this generic form. They did not say what the grace of baptism is or what it does; simply that through baptism grace is offered.

Luther, in the Smaller Catechism, in a statement far more full and specific says: "It [baptism] worketh the forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil and confers everlasting salvation on all who believe, as the word and promise of God declare."

In the Larger Catechism he further says: "In the second place inasmuch as we now know what baptism is, we must also learn the purpose and end for which it was instituted, that is, its benefits and effects. This we have admirably set forth in the words of Christ: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Mark 16 : 16. Hence conceive of the whole thing as

simply as possible, namely, the virtue, work, use, fruit and end of baptism is to save. For none is baptized in order to become a prince, but as the word says, in order to be saved. It is well known, however, that to be saved implies nothing less than to be liberated from sin, death and the devil, to come into the kingdom of Christ and to live eternally with him."

Anticipating the question, "How can water produce such great effects?" he answers, (and his answer contains the true philosophy and meaning of the sacrament): "It is not the water indeed that produces these effects, but the word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith which relies on the word of God connected with the water. For the water without the word of God, is simply water and no baptism. But when connected with the word of God it is a baptism, that is a gracious water of life and "a washing of regeneration" in the Holy Ghost; as St. Paul says to Titus, According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Titus 3 : 5-8.

Unquestionably in the judgment of Luther, grace, very great grace, even the fulness of salvation, is offered in baptism. Unquestionably he regarded baptism as a saving ordinance; saving, because commanded of the Lord as the great initiatory rite of church membership, joined in its administration with the divine word to be received by faith, and having the promise of the cleansing and the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit.

It is worthy of remark, just here, that it was he who brought the great fundamental doctrine of justification by faith into a clearness and a prominence it had not known since the days of the Apostle Paul, who likewise emphasized the benefits of the sacraments as few have done in any age of the Church. * * * A most striking delineation of the benefits of baptism, is given by Gerhard, one of the two theologians thought worthy by Bossuet to be named with Luther, as follows: "As baptism is not simply water, but water comprehended in, sanctified by and

united to the word of God, it is not used therefore to wash away the impurity of the body, but it is a divine and salutary means and organ, by which the whole sacred Trinity efficaciously operates for the salvation of man. Although the effects of baptism are various and multiform, yet following the apostle, (Titus 3 : 5) we reduce them all to these two heads, that baptism is the washing of *regeneration*, (John 3 : 5) which embraces the gift of faith, (Tit. 3 : 5) the remission of sins, (Luke 3 : 3; Acts 2 : 38; 22 : 16; Rom. 6 : 3) reception into the covenant of grace, (1 Pet. 3 : 21) adoption as the sons of God, (Gal 3 : 26) deliverance from the power of Satan, and possession of eternal life, (Col. 1 : 13, 14; Mark 16 : 16) and *renewal*, (Tit. 3 : 5) that is the Holy Spirit is given to him, who begins to renew the intellect, the will and all the powers of the soul, so that the lost image of God may begin to be restored in him, that the inner man may be renewed (2 Cor. 4 : 16) that the old man may be put off, and the new one put on, (Col. 3 : 10) that the Spirit may oppose the flesh and rule over it, so that sin may not have dominion in the body." (Schmid's Dogmatik, 562).

These words are designed to set forth the ideal conception of baptism—the administration and reception of that solemn rite according to the Lord's infinitely perfect will as revealed in the Scriptures. Far too often our conception falls below the ideal, the perfect, which in divine things is always the real. We falter and hesitate to believe that baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost should mean so much and that its benefits should be so great. These are indeed the very gifts of God through Christ to his redeemed and accepted children, living in union with their Saviour as the branches with the vine. But are they conferred through baptism? That they follow repentance and faith and a humble, glad surrender of the soul to Jesus Christ as sovereign Lord and Saviour, cannot be doubted by any who receive the Gospel as the power of God unto salvation.

Let us be just to the old theologians. Undoubtedly they meant that these signs of believing the Gospel and accepting Christ, namely repentance, faith and the surrender of the soul to

his care and guidance, must accompany baptism on the human side even as the divine word and Holy Spirit accompany it on the divine side. They, no more than we, believed that the benefits of baptism are received without repentance and faith. They ever repudiated the idea that the sacrament, *ex opere operato*, confers these priceless treasures of divine grace. Nevertheless it must be said that the language just quoted from Gerhard and to a less extent that of Luther, is open to the objection that it calls attention too much to the means, and too little to the author, of the means of grace—too much to the sacrament and too little to the living Person whom law and gospel and sacrament reveal.

On this phase of the subjects,—the benefits of baptism, another testimony is added, namely that of John Arndt, who, while he is not usually classed with the great dogmaticians, was possessed of such enviable learning, such vast and discriminating knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, such loyalty to true Lutheranism and so sweet an evangelical spirit; that he may well be ranked with the greatest and best. Indeed, his judgment may be even better than that of the dogmatic theologian. The dogmatician may be, and sometimes is, the slave of his system of doctrine. The careful, practical student of the Bible searching for its truths that he may preach them to his fellow men, may avoid dangers to which the other is subject. Be that as it may—the quotation is as follows:

"It is evident that from the passion and death of Christ, proceed both the satisfaction for our sins and the renewing of our nature by faith. Thus the new birth in us proceeds from Christ. And as a *means* to attain this end, holy baptism has been instituted, wherein we are baptized into the death of Christ, in order that we might die with him unto sin by the power of his death, and rise again from sin by the power of his resurrection. Thou believest that in baptism thou receivest remission of sins, the new birth, and adoption as a child of God. Thou believest aright. But unless thou find in thyself the fruit of baptism, the

new birth, the unction of the spirit and the divine illumination thy baptism shall avail thee nothing." (True Christianity, pp. 11, 380).

III. PROPER SUBJECTS FOR BAPTISM.

That adult believers are to be baptized is admitted by all who accept the binding obligation of the sacrament.

The article under consideration declares that—"Infants are to be baptized, who by baptism are presented to God and are received unto his favor."

The Apology explains and defends this doctrine as follows: "It is altogether certain that the divine promises of grace and the Holy Spirit belong not only to adults but to children. Now the promises do not apply to those who are out of the Church, where there is no gospel nor sacrament, for the kingdom of God exists only where the word of God and the sacraments are found. It is therefore a truly Christian and necessary practice to baptize children, in order that they may become participants of the gospel and of the promised grace and salvation as Christ has commanded."

In the Larger Catechism, Luther says: That infant baptism is pleasing to Christ is sufficiently proved by his own acts; namely, God has sanctified many of those and given the Holy Spirit to many, baptized in their infancy. But if God did not approve of infant baptism, he would not grant even a particle of grace from the Holy Spirit. In a word, if infant baptism were wrong, hitherto, down to the present day, there could not have been a Christian on earth. Now since God confirms baptism by the communication of his Holy Spirit, as it is truly perceived in some of the fathers, as St. Bernard, Gerson, John Huss and others who were baptized in their infancy, it must indeed be acknowledged that such baptism of children is pleasing to God. For he cannot be against himself, or favor falsehood and knavery, or grant his grace to this end."

1. The obligation to baptize children, and by so doing to make them members of the household of faith, inheres in the very nature and design of the Church.

The Church is the organism called into being by the Lord

through the covenant of grace and perpetuated by the use of the means of grace, namely, the word and sacraments. Had there been no covenant of grace there had been no Church. Were that covenant annulled the Church would cease to be. Wherever the Church is there are the subjects of grace and there are the visible signs of offered mercy and salvation to fallen man. "It is a faithful saying worthy of all acceptance that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."

It is alike true that the Church, purchased with his own blood and perpetuated by his power, exists in his purpose for the same object. It is intended to save sinners, turning them from the power of Satan unto God, and bringing them into his visible kingdom on earth. A priori, it would seem impossible that children should have been excluded from such a church, existing for such a purpose.

Accepting this postulate of the meaning and design of the Church, (If it have not this meaning and design it has none worthy of Bethlehem and Calvary), and it would require a positive divine command, to exclude children from it. Such divine command we can safely say, has never been given. On the contrary, in the Old Testament and in the New, God has given commandments and made provision for the children even as he has for their fathers. In the beginning of the Church, no distinction was made on account of age. Abraham the venerable patriarch and friend of God, and Isaac the circumcised infant, eight days old, were alike members of the Church.

"For proof of this" in the words of Dr. E. Greenwald, "we refer to Genesis, seventeenth chapter, which reads: And God said unto Abraham, thou shalt keep my covenant, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you and thy seed after thee: every man-child among you shall be circumcised; every man-child in your generations, he that is born in thy house or bought with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." (Bap. of Children, p. 12).

It is worthy of remark that the child bought with money, the slave child, was to be treated as a member of the family. The covenant was to reach him, even as it did the children born within the household. By the rite of circumcision the Gentile bond-servant became a member of the ancient church and shared in the privileges of the passover and had the promises of the people of God,—mute but significant prophecy of that later day of the higher and broader development of the Church, and declaration of the truth that “there is no respect of persons with him.” From that far off age down through nearly two thousand years to the advent of the world’s redeemer, the covenant of grace continued, the Church existed through various vicissitudes of prosperity and adversity, but the conditions of church membership knew no change.

There can not be a reasonable doubt that parents and children were alike members of the Jewish Church.

In the development of this thought it has been assumed that the organization among the descendants of Abraham, of which circumcision was the divinely ordained rite, really was the Church of the living God, and that the covenant with Abraham was the covenant of grace or gospel covenant. In support of this view Dr. Greenwald says: “That the covenant with Abraham was the covenant of grace or gospel covenant, is evident from many passages of Scripture, but we will quote but one, as it is so clear and direct as to be alone sufficient for the purpose.

“In the sixth, seventh and eighth verses of the third chapter of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians we read:

“‘Even as Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed. So then they which are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.’ Here it is not only asserted that Abraham was a model believer; that all believers, whether Jews or Gentiles have the same blessing in faithful Abraham; but it is especially said that that which was preached to him

was the Gospel; that the covenant made with him was the gospel covenant; that his faith under that covenant was evangelical or gospel faith; and that the blessings that descended to both Jews and Gentiles were based upon the promises and guarantees of that covenant, made to Abraham." (Bap. of Children, p. 10).

The truth is, the covenant of grace before the law and under the law and under the gospel is one. The father of the faithful and the great apostle to the Gentiles were not far apart, the one at the beginning of the old dispensation the other at the beginning of the new. They easily clasped hands—the hands of *faith*—across the gulf of twenty centuries.

"The New Testament lies concealed in the Old. The Old lies revealed in the New." *"Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad."*

2. This obligation is also set forth in the Saviour's commission to the apostles to make disciples of all "the nations," baptizing them into the name of the triune God.

(1) It is apparent from the preceding argument that children were allowed the privileges of membership in the Old Testament Church—nay, that they were expressly provided for, even as their fathers were, under the covenant of grace. The Saviour's command does not revoke that privilege, but continues it and provides for it, under the same covenant of grace in its wider application in the New Testament or Christian Church. The word "nations," says Dr. Krauth, embraces infants. "The redemption is as wide as the creation, and the power of application as wide as redemption. The 'nations' therefore which God has made, redeemed and desires to gather into his Church, are nations of children as well as adults." (Cons. Ref., p. 576).

Says Dr. F. W. Conrad: "The command thus issued by the Lord Jesus is not specific, directing ministers of the Gospel to baptize men, women and children, but generic, commissioning them to baptize all the nations, and therefore it includes children as well as adults. While the command to baptize is unrestricted to either age or sex, it is nevertheless limited by qualifications demanded as conditions of its reception. The qualifications thus required of adults are repentance and faith, and the requisition

for the baptism of children, is that at least one of the parents be a believer in Christ." (Luth. Doc. of Baptism).

(2) That the Saviour's command was understood by his apostles to *include* and not *exclude* children, is apparent from the following facts.

(a) The apostle Peter declares to the Jews at the first great Christian ingathering, that "the promise was to them *and their children*." (Acts 2 : 39). It was in the white light of that marvelous illumination that accompanied the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, in the tongues of flame.

Peter was enabled to see the meaning of things,—of Old Testament prophecy and type, of New Testament teaching and promise, as he had never seen them before. In the very focus of all the rays of divine teachings and providence he saw Jesus the crucified and risen Lord, and preached his Gospel as the only hope of the Jews who slew him, and of the Gentiles who knew not of him. To the agonizing cry of the Jews, "What must we do?" he answered, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins: for the promise is unto you and your children."

Says Matthew Henry in paraphrase and comment, concerning these words: "Your children shall have, as they have had, an interest in the covenant, and a title to the external seal of it. Come over to Christ to receive those inestimable benefits; for the promise of remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost is to you and your children. . . . It was very express, 'I will pour out my Spirit upon thy seed,' (Is. 44 : 3). And, 'My Spirit and my word shall not depart from thy seed and thy seed's seed,' (Is. 59 : 21). When God took Abraham into covenant he said, 'I will be a God to thee and to thy seed,' (Gen. 17 : 7); and, accordingly, every Israelite had his son circumcised, when eight days old. Now it is proper for an Israelite when he is by baptism come into a new dispensation of this covenant to ask, 'What must be done with my children? Must they be thrown out, or taken in with me?' 'Taken in,' says Peter, 'by all means, for the promise, that great promise of God's being to you a God, is as much to you and your children, now, as it ever

was.' 'And the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.'" Says Henry: "They are said to be *three thousand souls*, which word is generally used for persons when women and children are included with men, (Gen. 14 : 21), 'Give me the souls,' and (Gen. 46 : 27), 'Seventy souls,' which intimates that those who were baptized, were not so many men, but so many heads of families, as with their children and servants baptized, might make up three thousand souls."

(b) It is certain that the apostles baptized households or families.

Among which are named Lydia and her "household," (Acts 16 : 15), the jailer of Philippi and "all his," (Acts 16 : 33), the "household" of Stephanas, (1 Cor. 1 : 16), and though not so plainly stated, yet almost with equal certainty the households or families of Crispus and Cornelius.

It is certain that families are here meant. It is not absolutely certain that there were young children in any one of those families, but it is exceedingly probable that there were. As families exist in this world, at least three out of five contain children. If there were no children in any one of these five families thus reported, we have a very unusual occurrence, and we immediately meet with a second, not less rare—namely the simultaneous purpose of all the grown up members of these families to accept Christianity and be baptized. It is admitted that these things *might* all occur. But it is claimed that such combinations of unusual occurrences are very rarely found. There is just one thing, and only one, that will remove all difficulty in the case, and that is the postulate of infant baptism in the apostolic Church.

(c) The wide prevalence of infant baptism in the early history of the Church.

Says Dr. Conrad: "The Christian Fathers represent infant baptism as a universal custom derived from the apostles. Justin Martyr, born about the time of St. John's death, says: that among the members of the Church in his day, 'there were many of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old who were made disciples of Christ *in their infancy*.'"

Origen, born eighty-five years later, says: "There was a tradition in the Church, received from the apostles, that children also ought to be baptized."

Augustine, born about the middle of the fourth century, says: "The whole Church practices infant baptism; it was not instituted by councils, but was always in use, and that he never heard of any person, either in the Church or among the heretics, who denied the propriety of baptizing infants. In this testimony, Pelagius, who traveled in England, France, Italy, Africa and Palestine, corroborates. Infant baptism can thus be traced from the fifth century down to the first, yea to the very threshold of the apostolic Church."

If the inspired apostles understood their Lord to forbid infant baptism, it is exceedingly difficult to account for its speedy adoption in the post-apostolic Church and its universal practice throughout Christendom a few centuries later. For these reasons we deem it safe to conclude that infant baptism is of divine origin. In the words of Augustine, "it was always in use."

"Children being by baptism offered to God are received into his favor."

That is, they are received into the Church of Christ. It is a privilege to belong to the Church, to come into contact with her treasures of truth, to learn to know them and more and more to use them. The presence of the Church makes the difference between the darkness of heathenism and the light and blessings of Christian civilization. To be in the Church is to be in the favor of God.

This is all that need be said to meet the requirement of these words of the Confession. In this respect, infant baptism is anticipative. It is a providing for the future, by bringing the child into union with that divine institution, in which and through which ample provision is made for its future spiritual welfare on earth and in heaven.

The theologians of the Church, from Luther on, however, have held that to infants, even as to adults, baptism is a means of present grace, being used in the divine plan to remove the

guilt and dominion of sin and to regenerate the soul. This doctrine, it must be admitted, is not free from difficulties. This is readily seen when it is remembered that the grace of baptism in adults is conditioned on the exercise of faith. For this reason it has been thought necessary, by some of the theologians, to assume that baptized infants have faith. By faith, in this connection, however, is not meant *active* faith, in which the mind grasps and accepts the truths of the Gospel in the exercise of the will, but *passive* faith, that condition of the mind and heart in which no resistance is offered to the purpose and work of the Holy Spirit.

Unquestionably a very important and comforting truth is shadowed forth just here, namely, that the grace of God is prevenient, full and free, ever seeking all who will not set themselves against it, and withheld from none for whom Christ died.

It floods the world of sinful man as the light of the sun floods the natural world. Let no obstruction be placed in its way, and it will reach every soul with saving, regenerating power. Even the adult in the exercise of his intellect and will, but makes himself passively submissive to the reception of divine grace.

"Our wills are ours we know not how—
Our wills are ours to make them thine."
"Thy will be done."

Can it be safely said that the passivity of the infant is this condition for the reception of baptismal grace,—that the unconscious child, offering no resistance to the Spirit of God is the fit subject for his saving power in the sacrament of baptism?

There is an old rabbinical aphorism, which reads: "*Learn to say I do not know.*" There is ample room for thought and speculation here, none for dogmatism.

I am free to say, that I do not know. And with great respect, even reverence for the ability of learned men, I feel safe in saying, no one else knows. Luther wrestled with the subject in his day, and finally handed it over to the "Doctors" for solution. The Doctors, thus far have not reported any very encouraging pro-

gress, nor are they likely to, save possibly in the grace of humility, arising from baffled powers and the consciousness of human limitations. As to the manner of the Lord's gracious work in the unconscious child we can safely and wisely leave that to him whose resources are infinite and whose commands we are simply to obey. "Thus it becomes us to fulfill all righteousness."

The Scriptures teach that children have been sanctified in their early years, some even from birth. Jer. 1 : 5 ; Luke 1 : 15. And we read that "Jesus took little children ("babes," Luke calls them) in his arms and blessed them, laying his hands upon them." Mark 10 : 16 ; Luke 18 : 15, R. V.

Unquestionably it was a real blessing bestowed by our Lord. We need not trouble ourselves with the question as to how much faith these babes had, or whether it was active or passive faith, or whether they had faith at all. The little ones were brought to him with the tender solicitude of love for their welfare, even as parents bring their children to him now in holy baptism, and he blessed them and said, "Of such is the kingdom of God."

What he did then he can and will do now,—we believe he is doing now, to that far greater number who have been consecrated to his service with earnest trustful prayer and the solemn rite of the sacrament.

And it is to be borne in mind that children are to be baptized not so much to prepare them for death, if the Lord shall call them out of this world in their early years. They are to be baptized in preparation for life.

The baptismal covenant requires the Christian nurture of the child and looks forward to confirmation—the time when the meaning of baptism will be realized in the confession of Christ before men as Saviour and Lord. "Baptism is the Children's sacrament, (Martensen's Dogmatics, p. 432), as the eucharist is the sacrament for adults." The great majority of our communicants were baptized in infancy, and it will continue to be so, more and more as the true idea of the Church prevails, and church life and Christian home-life blend into one.

ARTICLE II.

WOMAN'S MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH.

BY REV. G. U. WENNER, D. D.

Woman's work in the Church is an after thought among Protestants. It is not pleasant to have to make such a confession. The early Church recognized the place of woman in the public service. This is evident from frequent allusions in the letters of St. Paul. And in subsequent church history there is many a chapter that treats of the work of the deaconesses or servants of the Church. In Chrysostom's time, in the fourth century, there were as many as forty employed in the large church in Constantinople.

The monastic orders of the Middle Ages took the place of the institution of Deaconesses, and put an end to the public ministrations of women. After the twelfth century traces only can be found of an office that at one time was as distinctly recognized as was that of pastor or bishop. When the Reformation came, the principles of woman's service in the Church were clearly recognized by Luther, but the conditions of society and the Church were such as not to admit of any practical application. In 1634 Vincent de Paul established the order of the Sisters of Charity and for nearly two centuries the Roman Catholic Church in France enjoyed almost a monopoly of the benefits derived from woman's public ministry in the Church. It is true, there were a few scattered congregations in Holland and along the Rhine where this ancient office was retained, and some indeed believe that Vincent got his ideas from these Protestant deaconesses, but it would be hard to prove this position. Not till the beginning of the present century are there any signs of a general recognition among Protestants of the legitimacy of woman's ministry in the Church.

Our own period has witnessed a restoration of this ancient office and has given to it a significance which it perhaps never

before possessed, not even in its palmy days. Our age is fruitful in efforts at social progress, and the general interest that is manifest in such subjects is one of the most hopeful signs of the times. But there is reason to believe that among all the agencies for helping and healing humanity in body and in soul there is none that can compare in value with that of the Deaconess work.

In England the germinal moments are probably to be found in the writings of Hannah More and doings of Elizabeth Fry. The latter entered Newgate prison in 1813 and found an indescribable condition of moral and physical wretchedness. She was called a fanatic, but she reformed the prison, and she reformed the public sentiment of England.

In Germany the Napoleonic wars had brought the women together into associations for helping the sick and the wounded soldiers. When the wars were over, the thought suggested itself to continue the societies for the purpose of helping other sick and poor. So it came to pass that when Fliedner began his work in Kaiserswerth in 1833, many earnest hearts had already been considering the problems that engaged his own mind. When the cholera broke out in Hamburg in 1831, Amalie Sieveking sent out an appeal to the women to follow her into the hospital and help to nurse the sick. No one responded, and she entered alone. The world called her a lunatic, but when she came out, it had received a new idea.

But the birthplace of the new deaconess movement was at Kaiserswerth on the Rhine. It was an almost moribund parish in a Roman Catholic community. But it was afterward remembered that the seal of his church contained the inscription "The mustard seed becomes a tree." A discharged female convict applied to Pastor Fliedner for refuge. He received her and placed her in charge of Gertrude Reichardt. Other helpers soon came to take care of other helpless ones, sick in body and in soul, and thus the mustard seed was planted.

Within a few years, and apparently from independent motives, other houses were established in Strassburg, at Neuendettelsau a village in Bavaria, in Dresden and in Berlin. The usual op-

position assailed the movement for the first twenty-five years, and then followed the record of its marvelous growth and success. Sixty-six houses on the continent now number more than ten thousand sisters who on more than three thousand stations are giving their lives to the service of Christ and humanity with no inducement of earthly fee or reward.

In England the movement was introduced early in the sixties, although it assumed a somewhat different character there. Many of the sisterhoods of the Anglican Church impose vows upon the candidates, a feature which is foreign to the German idea. In the diocese of London, the deaconess is regularly ordained by the bishop and is assigned to special duties in the churches. Among the reasons for a less rapid progress of the deaconess work in England are first, the institution of trained nurses. This was introduced by Elizabeth Fry in 1840, and it meets to a large extent the want which the deaconess work seeks to supply. Secondly, the distinction of classes prevents the *esprit du corps* or enthusiasm of Christian fellowship which is one of the chief characteristics of the work. In Germany, the Deaconess, whether she be a countess or a peasant, is simply a sister. In England there is a distinction between the ladies and the nurses. The latter are expected to do most of the hard work. But there are a number of institutions also, notably that of Tottenham, London, that are patterned more or less after the German model.

In this country the work has struck root only within the last ten years. As early as 1849 Fliedner himself brought over five sisters to Pittsburg and established a house. The sisters did good work in the hospital and orphans' home. But the institution did not grow. There was as yet no need for such a work it seems. In New York Dr. Muhlenberg established the Sisterhood of the Holy Communion on the plans of the Kaiserswerth House, but the mustard seed has not become a tree, and St. Luke's is to-day conducted by trained nurses and not by deaconesses.

In 1884 the German hospital in Philadelphia requested the aid of deaconesses in caring for its sick. A company of ten deaconesses in Germany responded. The experiment suc-

ceeded. Mr. Lankenau has built for them a house costing half a million of dollars and has endowed it with another half a million. They now number forty and the work prospers. In the meantime a branch of the Pittsburg House was transplanted to Milwaukee and it has attained a healthy and vigorous growth. Swedish and Norwegian houses in Brooklyn, Omaha and Minneapolis, and an English house in Baltimore, bring the number of Lutheran Houses to six with about one hundred and fifty deaconesses. Successful houses have also been established in Dayton, Cincinnati, Cleveland, St. Louis and other cities, many of which are undenominational in character. In several dioceses of the Protestant Episcopal Church deaconess training-schools have been established, and deaconesses have become a part of the regular ministry. But the palm for most rapid and substantial success belongs to the Methodist Episcopal Church, which in its last report shows for America alone thirty-six houses and three hundred and eighty-nine deaconesses. The flexibility of its methods enables churches of widely differing forms of polity to use it successfully in the promotion of their work.

The deaconess must not be confounded with the trained nurse. Although the nurse deaconess has the same technical training that a trained nurse is expected to have, she differs from the latter in this, that she receives no pay for her services. Besides her food and raiment she receives a small amount for pocket money, in Germany about twenty dollars a year, in America perhaps fifty dollars. Her work also covers a larger field. Many of the deaconesses are teachers of Kindergartens and of primary schools. Some engage in rescue work in Magdalen asylums and in prisons. Others labor in asylums for idiots, epileptics and helpless ones of every degree, where there is need for not merely technical training, but for Christian patience and devotion. Her object, finally, is not merely the care of the body, or the health of society. It has a spiritual purpose. She seeks rather through the ministry of Christian service to carry the message which will bring health to the soul, in the spirit of the motto of Elizabeth Fry, "The soul of charity is charity to the soul." Hence, too, the ideal field of labor of the

deaconess (Gal. 2) is the local congregation where she acts as a co-laborer and helping hand of the minister of the word. Her institutional work is but the preparatory school for this which is considered her best and most important sphere. Some have feared that in this field the deaconess might prove a substitute for the volunteer worker, and hence an obstruction to an important element in every working church. But experience has proved that the very opposite result follows. The example of a trained female ministry has the effect of calling forth the best activity of the other members.

The deaconess must also not be confounded with the members of such sisterhoods of Roman Catholic and other Churches as are bound by vows to the work for life or even for a certain period. Under reasonable conditions they can at any time lay aside their special work and return to home duties; or, if they desire, and are called, they may enter the marriage relation. In point of fact the larger proportion enter upon it as a life work and find in it a never failing inspiration to high and noble effort.

The significance of this work must have suggested itself even in so brief an account of its origin and methods. It means the employment of much waste material, the application of hitherto unused force in the work of the Church. In our ocean steamers it is said that only a fraction of the force derived from the combustion of coal is turned to account. The greater part escapes through the smokestack and is never applied. Hitherto we have lost some of the best mental and spiritual forces of the Church by failing to secure for women an appropriate sphere of usefulness. This work affords to women unbounded opportunities for the doing of just that kind of work for which they are peculiarly fitted, in the healing and helping, the comforting and the rescuing activities of the Church.

But while on the one hand this institution affords to women a fitting field of labor, it on the other hand gives to the Church a force which has never been more needed than at the present time. The relation which the Church sustains to social changes and needs, especially in the larger towns and cities, calls for a

higher organization and a more practical ministry. The addition, not of forty, but of only three or four trained and consecrated women to the working forces of one of our city churches, while it would add but little to its financial burdens, would contribute in a marked degree to its practical usefulness and power. Much of the work that ought to be but cannot be done by the pastor, could be done most effectively by the deaconess. And in her relation to the ailing members of the community, the deaconess would supply in the name of the Church, or rather in the name of Christ, much of that help which is now derived from secular and humanitarian sources. She would lighten many a burden by strengthening the hands of those who bear it, and thus the Church, by a larger and more comprehensive contact with the daily needs of the common people, would prepare the way for him who himself went about "preaching the Gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people."

ARTICLE III.

WHAT IS THE TEACHING OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION CONCERNING THE LORD'S DAY?

BY REV. T. F. REESER, A. M.

There is an authority of faith; and there is a declaration of faith. By the "authority of faith" we mean, the ultimate cardinal, divine principle, upon which, in the last resort, our faith rests itself as a foundation. By the "declaration of faith" we mean, the practical expression, in phraseology and statement, of that faith as it has been conceived and held in the human consciousness. A clear-cut conception of this single truth enables us at once, to give to the Holy Scriptures—and to all human creeds drawn therefrom—their rightful place and value in systems of theology and in all the practical affairs of Christian life which confront us. The Holy Scriptures *alone* are the authority of our faith, just as in practical life they are the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Creeds are but the declaration of

the way in which the human mind has apprehended and interpreted the fundamentals of faith as it has conceived them to be contained in the Holy Scriptures—the original source, warrant, and authority of faith. Back of the Holy Scriptures we cannot go; back of all human creeds we may go. The one is God's authority; the other is man's authority. The one is infallible; the other fallible. No human creed can stand, therefore, in independency, upon its own foundations as authority, or carry its own rule of authority within itself. After all, the Holy Scriptures are the touch-stone by which every creed, in the last resolve, must be measured, and in the light of which it must be interpreted. This is the very glory of our venerable Augustana, the oldest of Protestant symbols, that it does not carry its own authority within itself, but insists that in every word, line, and letter, it itself is to be measured, tested, and interpreted in the light of the Holy Scriptures. So, it is a mark of loyalty to this symbol, that in matters of symbolic interpretation, we rest ourselves not upon the authority or expression of the symbol itself, but upon the authority of the Holy Scriptures, from which the framers of it themselves drew their authority. And so, dealing with an article about which there has been confessedly much disputation, we cannot hope to find the standard of measurement within the disputed phraseologies of the symbol itself, but our appeal must be to historical Lutheranism, and to the Holy Scriptures, the standard by which the symbol itself enjoins us it must be measured. And to these original sources of authority, we therefore, largely make our appeal.

But, in determining "What is the teaching of the Augsburg Confession Concerning the Lord's Day," let us avail ourselves of the articles that treat thereupon, and the exact phraseology which is used concerning it in the Confession. Although the Sixth Article of the Confession, that bearing upon the "New Obedience," is usually not pressed into the service to do duty for the observance of the Lord's Day—yet in it, it appears to me, lies the norm of the whole matter. In this Article, I find it in these words: "That it is our duty to perform those good

works, which God has commanded." It will become apparent as I run along the line of my argument, why this sixth article necessarily connects itself with the question I am now discussing. For the present, it will be sufficient to say that it teaches us how, in the life of the "New Obedience," we are to regard and hold the commandments of God. Its language is, "It is our duty to perform those good works which God has commanded."

Leaving for the present this article, we go to Article Fifteen, that which treats of "Church Rites." This article, in subject matter, deals precisely with the same matters as Article Twenty-eighth, which is but an amplification, in abuses corrected, of Article Fifteen of the original Twenty-one. In the Twenty-eight Article, we shall find, therefore, all that is contained or implied in this fifteenth article, so that this fifteenth article may be passed over without claiming any further attention from us. Article Twenty-eight with which we have specially to do, treats "Of the Power of the Bishops or Clergy."

The confessors, battling with certain problems which confronted them in their time, aimed Scripturally to define the *civil* and *ecclesiastical* rights of the clergy. So far as it concerns our present purpose we may drop the civil, and look only upon the ecclesiastical side of this power. The disputation was, whether bishops had the right and power of prescribing ceremonies in the Church, such as ordinances concerning meats, holy days, and different grades of ecclesiastical officers or not. Some affirmed they had the power; others denied it. Those who affirmed this power adduced the example of the apostles, Acts 15 : 20, where they prohibited the use of blood and things strangled. In addition to this, they alleged that the Sabbath was changed into Sunday or Lord's Day, contrary to the decalogue, as they considered it; and no example is urged and referred to so frequently as the change of the Sabbath, by which they intend to establish the point that the power of the Church is very great, as she dispensed with the decalogue, and made a change in it.

The opposing party, among whom were the confessors, denied that the bishops had the power to determine and appoint

anything contrary to the Gospel. "It is manifestly contrary to the word of God," said they, "to make or enjoin laws with the view of making thereby satisfaction for sin and obtaining grace; for the honor of the Saviour's merits is tarnished when we presume to merit grace by such human appointments." It is well to observe the principle against which they are contending, and which runs through the whole of this article; viz., that of meriting saving grace through the observance of any such ordinances as might be appointed and observed in the Church. I repeat, therefore, that their protest is against meriting salvation through the observance of any of these ordinances, or as if these things *ex opere operato* were saving. Their thought is, that neither the observance of meats, and ordinances, or holy days, or sabbaths in themselves procure saving grace, but faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and faith in him only. The principle of justification by faith is the principle which they are exalting, and everywhere defending, and also at the same time the principle of Christian liberty wherewith "Christ hath made us free." This point is made clear by the cogent way in which the confessors express themselves when they say: "It must always be retained as the cardinal article of the Gospel, that *we obtain the grace of God by faith in Christ, without any merit of our own, and do not merit it by any works appointed by men.*"

With the matter of ordinances in the Church, the Sabbath question connects itself. Therefore, the confessors ask, "And what are we to believe concerning Sunday, (the Lord's Day), and other similar ordinances and ceremonies of the Church? To this inquiry they reply, "The bishops and clergy may make regulations, that order may be observed in the Church, not with the view of thereby obtaining the grace of God, nor in order thus to make satisfaction for sins, nor to bind the conscience, to hold and regard this as a necessary worship of God, or to believe that they would commit sin if they violated these regulations without offence to others. Thus St. Paul to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11 : 5) has ordained that women should have their heads covered in the congregation; also, that the ministers should not all speak at the same time in the congregation, but in an

orderly manner, one after an other." "It is becoming," they continue, "in a Christian congregation to observe such order, for the sake of love and peace, and to obey the bishops and clergy in these cases, and to observe these regulations so far as not to give offence to one another, so that there may be no disorder or unbecoming conduct in the Church. Nevertheless, the consciences of men must not be oppressed, by representing these things as necessary to salvation, or teaching that they are guilty of sin, if they break these regulations without offence to others; for no one affirms that a woman commits sin who goes out with her head uncovered, without giving offence to the people."

Such also is the ordinance concerning Sunday, Easter, Whitsunday, and similar festivals and customs. *For those who suppose that the ordinance concerning Sunday instead of Sabbath, is enacted as necessary, (necessary to salvation), are greatly mistaken.* For the Holy Scripture has abolished the Sabbath, and teaches that all the ceremonies of the old law may be omitted, since the publication of the Gospel. And yet as it was necessary to appoint a certain day, in order that the people might know when they should assemble, the Christian Church has appointed Sunday (the Lord's Day) for this purpose, and to this change she was the more inclined and willing, that the people might have an example of Christian liberty, and that they might know that the observance of neither the Sabbath nor any other day is necessary, (necessary to their salvation). They then further explain themselves by saying: "There have been numerous erroneous disputations published concerning the change of the law, the ceremonies of the New Testament, and the change of the Sabbath, which have all sprung from the false and erroneous opinion, that Christians must have such a mode of divine worship as is conformed to the Levitical or Jewish service, and that Christ enjoined it on the apostles and bishops to invent new ceremonies which should be necessary to salvation."

At some length I have now set forth nearly all that this article teaches concerning the Sabbath—both the Jewish and the Christian Sabbath or Lord's Day. How now are we to understand these teachings? If the language of the Confession is not

clear enough, then we must go to the original authority upon which the Confession bases itself, and to which itself recommends us. And that the language of the Confession is not self-interpreting is clear from the widely diverging—almost diametrically opposite—views which are held concerning the teachings of the symbol. However other branches of the Lutheran Church may interpret this article, and however firmly we may have believed it to have been settled among ourselves, yet among us of the General Synod, because of the practical issues that have confronted some of the synods in the ordination of young men to the ministry, the question has assumed a necessary and practical interest, even if not new. The question is, can young men be consistently ordained to the ministry of our Church who repudiate the General Synod's official utterances concerning the divine obligation of the Sabbath day, *i. e.* the Christian Sabbath, or is the General Synod wrong, and is it necessary for it to repeal its own official utterances? What is the teaching of the Augsburg Confession concerning the Lord's Day?

In appealing this question to the Scriptures, our first inquiry shall be, Whence does the world date its Sabbath? Two views here meet us: the one, the generic Sabbath of creation when God rested upon the seventh day from his labors and blessed and sanctified it; the other, the specific Sabbath of the Jews, enjoined upon that people, at the time of the giving of the Law upon Sinai.

In support of the first view, that of the generic creation Sabbath we might gather much history of an overwhelming character—but for which we do not have the time here. It is sufficient to say that Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, Persia, Barbaric Greece, and many other nations, in their unearthed records, have all left unmistakable evidence of the observance of a seventh day, a Sabbath day, behind them. We refer any one desirous of gathering up this historic testimony to the works of W. W. Atterbury, Wilbur F. Crafts, and to an article entitled "Extra-Biblical Evidence of the Primitive Sabbath" by Jesse W. Brooks. But the question is, is there any Biblical warrant for primitive Sabbath observance previous to the giving of the Law upon Sinai by

Moses? I think no one can read over the fifth chapter of Exodus, where Pharaoh imposed the heavier burden upon the Hebrews of making bricks without straw, and where the king chided them for being part of the time idle, without having suggestions come to him, that Moses and Aaron were either among a Sabbatized people or were trying to Sabbatize them. But passing this strangely suggestive chapter by, with its inferences pointing to a Sabbath, we come to clearly affirmed certainties. In the book of Exodus, where the first giving of the manna is described, we have these words: "And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, this is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until morning." And on the morrow, the seventh day, Moses is represented as saying: "Eat that to-day which ye have laid up; for to-day is a Sabbath day unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." Now, the law of Moses was not given until some time afterward, so we have here certainly a Sabbath before the giving of the Law. But the attempt has been made to explain it prophetically, of which our own Dr. Valentine says: "One feels reluctant to characterize the expedient in this suggestion as it deserves."

Nor is this all. The first word of the third commandment becomes significant in the light in which we are now surveying this question. Why the word "remember" before the commandment which enjoins the observance of the Lord's Day? Dr. Hodge says: "The language used in the third commandment, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, naturally implies that the Sabbath was not a new institution. It was a law given in the beginning, that had doubtless in a good measure, especially during the bondage in Egypt, become obsolete, which the people were henceforth to remember and faithfully observe."

Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, Baumgarten and Buddeus all essentially agree that "God, after his six days of creative work, because his Sabbatismos could become the Sabbatismos of his creatures, made for that purpose the seventh day, by his blessing, to be a perennial fountain of refreshment, and clothed that day by hallowing it with a special glory for all time to come."* And what say the Reformers? Luther: "The Sabbath existed before the law of Moses came and had been, indeed, from the beginning of the world."† Melancthon, the author of the Confession, in speaking of the laws contained within the Decalogue, says: "They sounded at all times in the Church, even before Moses."‡ Gerhard, on "remember" in the commandment, says: "Since immediately at the creation a Sabbath was sanctified by God, so the memory of this is renewed by a word of recollection."§ Calovius, emphasizing "the consecration of the seventh day to divine worship from the sabbath of creation," declares that this is the position "undoubted among our (Lutheran) theologians, who here agree with one consent."|| And Quenstedt asserts and defends the position, that "the sanctification of the Sabbath was not instituted first at the time of Moses, when the Decalogue was promulgated on Mount Sinai, but was ordained immediately from the creation of the world."¶ Dr. C. P. Krauth, with his vast knowledge and wide research, affirms: "We can not for two centuries after the Reformation find a solitary theologian, rigid as was their adherence to the Confession, who did not reject the idea that the words in Gen. 2 : 3 were put there by anticipation, (by anticipation of the Mosaic Sabbath). All of them contend for a primitive Sabbath."*** He says well, therefore, "The inference is resistless that the confessors did not teach nor imply that the devotion of one day in seven to God, was of Mosaic origin."

The Jews did, however, receive a special code of laws for the

*Quoted from Hodge's *Sys. Theol.*, vol. iii., p. 326.

†Com. on Ex. 16 : 23.

‡Loci Communes, 1545.

§Loci Theologici De Lege, 123.

||Biblia Illustrata, 1 p. 56.

¶Theol. Did. Pol. De Lege Dei, 1., 2.

****Ev. Review*, Jan. 1857.

government of their nation, and for theirs only, and with this came the *specific* Jewish Sabbath. This code was of a threefold nature: civil, ceremonial, moral. What was civil and ceremonial was for the government of their nation solely, as for example, the prohibition of fire on the Sabbath in a warm country where no fire was needed; or, the manner of conducting their worship and the sacrifices which they should offer upon every Sabbath day as prescribed in Numbers 28: 9, 10. But the moral law contained in the Decalogue was binding upon them not as Jews, but as men—binding them only as primordial laws bound them—and bound all the other rational life of the world. Hollazius on this point says: "The Primordial moral law and the Sinaitic do not differ in substance of doctrine but in the mode of revelation."* Gerhard says: "The moral law is summarily comprehended in the Decalogue."† It is however generally recognized that in the third commandment there is a ceremonial or specific feature. It is the designation of the specific seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord, in contradistinction from the eighth or ninth or any other day. This particular feature is very generally admitted and even insisted upon by Lutheran theologians to be Jewish and ceremonial. Melancthon, the writer of the Confession, here again says: "The genus which is embraced in this commandment is moral and perpetual. As regards this genus, Christians are bound by this commandment. The genus is immutable, and is the chief thing in this command. But as regards the species, that is the observance of the seventh day, it is ceremonial."‡ And with him stands Chemnitz, Gerhard, Calovius, Quenstedt, and the whole line of the early Lutheran dogmatists. The specific Hebrew Sabbath demanded the seventh day; the generic Sabbath the seventh of time. And so our confessors uniformly teach, that the seventh of days is ceremonial; but the seventh of time is moral. And they teach also that what is ceremonial has passed away; but what is moral abides and must abide.

Holding firmly in mind, now, the attitude of the confessors

*Quoted in Schmid's Dog., p. 517. †Quoted in Schmid's Dog., p. 517.

‡Catechism for Youth, Corp. Reformatum 23, p. 134.

toward the generic Sabbath, with its moral requirement of the seventh of time, I wish to recall to mind the phraseology in our article which says, "The Holy Scripture has abolished the Sabbath." In what sense now are our confessors here to be understood? Why certainly in the sense of what they have elsewhere written upon the same matter. Rightly understood, there lies a sublime truth in these words of the Confession; and wrongly understood, they strike a vital blow at that divine institution which Justice McLean, of the United States Supreme Court, has called "*the conservator of the Christian religion.*" The Scripture upon which the declaration of the "abrogation of the Sabbath" rests itself, is Ephesians 2 : 15, which reads as follows: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." And again, Col. 2 : 16, 17: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." And yet once more, Rom. 14 : 5: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Holding in mind now that the author of the Confession and the subscribers thereto, were men who believed in a generic creation Sabbath of universal obligation and perpetually binding—with a generic seventh of time as sacred to God—what of necessity must be their interpretation of these Scriptures? Could they say in one breath, the Sabbath is perpetually binding and good for all time, and in the next say, "The Holy Scripture has abolished the Sabbath?" Absurd the conception! These men were not fools. Nothing could have been further from their conception than that this generic Sabbath which they believed to be universally and perpetually binding, and which the Saviour, as Lord of the Sabbath, had cleansed from all human excrescences, and had declared made for man," should have suddenly and wholly come to an end with the incoming of the era of grace into the world. And yet this is just precisely the contradiction

we must attribute to, and charge upon them, if we accord to the Confession, and the language contained therein, the full complete abrogation of the Sabbath day, in the sense that the world no longer has a generic Sabbath. The abrogation to which they refer is not moral but ceremonial; for there is, there can be, no abrogation of moral law. Jewish ritual was abrogated, and with it the ceremonial Sabbath. And in the light of their own writings, in the broadest and fullest sense, to our mind, that is precisely what they meant in the Confession by the abrogation of the Sabbath. In reference to the Scriptures above quoted, Dr. Valentine says: "It is absolutely certain, and evident upon its very face, that the apostle in these passages had no reference whatever to the Lord's Day, but to the Jewish seventh-day Sabbath and other holy days." Of it Canon Cook says: "The very language used is absolutely decisive." And Dr. Hodge says of them: "They have no reference to the weekly Sabbath, which had been observed from the creation, and which the apostles themselves introduced and perpetuated in the Christian Church."*

Knowing their views, therefore, as we do—gathered up in ample measure from their other writings—when they say as they do in the Confession, "Neither the Sabbath nor any other day is necessary," it ought not to be difficult—can not be—to gather up the ellipsis (necessary to salvation) which ran through their mind. And all the more so, because in the very next sentence they explain their meaning when they say: "There have been numerous erroneous disputations published, concerning the change of the law, the ceremonies of the New Testament, and the change of the Sabbath, which have all sprung from the false and erroneous opinion that Christians must have such a mode of divine worship as is conformed to the Levitical or Jewish service, and that Christ enjoined it upon the apostles and bishops to invent new ceremonies which should be necessary to salvation." The simple supply of the ellipsis will make their meaning unmistakably plain. And to show that this ellipsis was in their mind, and must be supplied, we need only go to the

**Sys. Theol.*, vol. iii., p. 332.

language of the Confession itself. Article xv., which treats of this very matter in hand, after speaking of "rites and ordinances," says: "It is taught on this point, that all ordinances and traditions of men, for the purpose of *reconciling God and meriting grace*, are contrary to the Gospel and the doctrine of faith in Christ; wherefore, monastic vows, and traditions concerning the difference of meats, days, &c., *intended for the purpose of meriting grace and making satisfaction for sins*, are impotent and contrary to the Gospel." And, if we need anything further on this point, we may go to the language of the Apology of the Confession where the confessors state the point clearly and unmistakably. In discussing the use of ordinances, they say: "The inquiry is not: shall human ordinances be observed on account of external discipline and tranquillity? *The question is altogether different*; it is: *is the observance of such human ordinances, a divine service by which God is reconciled*; and can we be righteous before God without such statutes? THIS IS THE CHIEF INQUIRY, and when this shall have been finally answered, it will be easy to judge whether the unity of the Church requires uniformity in such ordinances."* The question put in this way by the confessors themselves is scarcely liable to misconception and shows precisely the errors against which they combated.

Again, the Apology of the Confession, in its treatment of Article iv., under the head of Justification, after declaring that their adversaries employed the ten commandments only for the purpose of building up an "external piety of good works," uses this language, showing the true light in which the confessors regarded the Ten Commandments—not nine of them, but the ten: "We, however, hold and assert of external piety, that God *requires and demands* such a correct life; and that on account of God's commandment, *we must perform the good works prescribed in the Ten Commandments*."† There is here, it will be observed, no hint of the complete abrogation of the third commandment, but the unquestioned evidence that there were ten commandments to be observed and obeyed, not nine. And so again,

*Apology, Book of Concord, p. 223.

†Book of Concord, New Market Ed., p. 161.

under the head of human ordinances, after speaking of the evil consequences of a "pompous display of holiness" upon the part of their enemies, the confessors say: "Moreover, the really good works, which God requires in the ten commandments, are (it grieves us to say) wholly suppressed by such hypocritical acts." The point I am pressing here is, that the confessors regarded the binding force of the ten commandments as a DIVINE REQUIREMENT. The third carried this element within itself as well as the other nine. The third commandment with the generic principle of seventh of time rests precisely, in their mind, upon the same basis as all the other nine. There is, therefore, in making these commandments a divine requirement, no escaping the logical conclusion that they regarded the Sabbath, *not as a human ordinance but a divine institution*. I might go on multiplying evidences from the Apology, but it is enough. Including, as they did, the third commandment in the ten, and declaring ALL THE TEN to be of DIVINE REQUIREMENT, we do not see how, unless by a most reckless interpretation or a wilful disregard for historic principles, the confessors can have contributed to their language used, either in the Apology of the Confession, or the Confession itself, the full complete abrogation of the moral element of the third commandment. When our confessors say, therefore, as they do in the Confession, "Those, then, who are of opinion that such institution of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, was established as a thing necessary, err very much," their meaning is: that the change of Sabbath was not made from the Jewish Sabbath to Lord's Day as a thing necessary to salvation: and when they say that "neither the Sabbath nor any other day is necessary," they mean precisely the same thing, *i. e.* necessary to salvation. They mean that our salvation hinges solely upon Christ, and apart from saving faith in him, the observance of no day, the doing of no deed, and the observance of no law, are *per se* saving—a proposition to which we would all most heartily, without exception, assent. And when they speak of the abrogation of the Sabbath, they mean simply the Jewish ceremonial, not the moral element of the third commandment, the generic Sabbath of creation—which they believed and declared to be universally

binding upon all men, in the principle of a generic seventh of time—and perpetual to all the ages to come.

Moreover, another matter gives strength to the position we are here maintaining. It is well known that the "Editio Princeps" was the only document subscribed and sealed.* "Luther knew no other Augsburg Confession in the German than this." Vossius writes: "I know also that the princes of Germany, who adhere to the Augsburg Confession, acknowledge no other except that exhibited to Charles V., in 1530."† "It was received into the bodies of doctrine of the whole Church," writes Dr. C. P. Krauth.‡

Turning now to this recognized text of Luther, and of the Church during his lifetime, let us see what this, which should be the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, teaches. In literal translation it reads as follows: "For the Church has not displaced or annulled the Sabbath, but God himself has taught that we, in the New Testament should not be bound by the law of Moses. Therefore have *the apostles* let the Sabbath fall, to remind us thereby that we are not bound to the law of Moses. And yet since it is necessary in order that the people may know when they should come together, to determine a certain day, they (*i. e.* the apostles) have ordained Sunday, that men should therein hear and learn the word of God." And nothing can make clearer to us what constitutes the proper sanctification of the Lord's Day than the words of Luther in his Larger Catechism, when he says: "Since then, so much depends on the word of God, that without it no Sabbath day can be sanctified, we should know that God desires to have this commandment strictly observed, and that he will punish all who reject his word and are unwilling to hear and learn it, especially at the time appointed for this purpose. Therefore, not only those sin against this commandment, who grossly abuse and openly profane the Sabbath day, as those who, on account of avarice or wantonness, neglect to hear the word of God, or lie in taverns, full and stu-

*Hist. Introd. to Augs. Conf., p. 51.

†Hist. Introd. to Augs. Conf., p. 51.

‡Dr. Krauth's Introd. to Augs. Conf., p. xxxiv.

pid like swine; but those, also, who listen to the word of God as to idle talk, and attend preaching merely for the sake of fashion; and when the year is gone by know as little as they did before."

But if these "Abrogationists" can not wrest the hands of the confessors from the grasp of the permanent obligation of the Sabbath day, and the generic principle of one seventh of time to holy worship and rest, they ask us for our authority for observing the first day of the week instead of the seventh. They challenge our authority, in the New Testament, for the change and warrant for such observance. Again, the confessors, reformers, and dogmatists shall speak for themselves. Luther: "I believe that the apostles transferred the Sabbath to Sunday, otherwise no man would have been so audacious as to dare to do it. And I believe that they did it especially that they might tear from the hearts of the people the imagination that they were justified and holy through the law, and in order that men might be surely and steadfastly persuaded that the law is not necessary to salvation. But the apostles were moved thereto by the resurrection of Christ our Lord, and the sending of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost."* Again, he says: "As the Sabbath is now changed for us into Sunday, and other days are work days; Sunday is a day of rest, or holy day, or sacred day." "And would to God that in Christendom there were no holy day except Sunday, and that all the festivals were put upon Sunday."† In his Larger Catechism, in his comments upon the third commandment, he uses this language: "God will have this commandment strictly kept, and will punish all those who despise his word, and will not hear or learn it, especially at the time appointed therefor." And one may well stop here to inquire: Was Luther illogical enough to believe one in danger of sinning against a commandment of God which he believed to be perfectly abrogated, and to be of no binding authority whatever upon men? It is a strange contradiction, indeed, to teach that a man may sin against a commandment which has no binding authority in the least upon him.

*Tischreden, Erlangen Ed. 60, p. 388.

†Sermon on Good Works.

Melanchthon says: "The apostles changed the day, for this very reason, that they might show an example of the abrogation of the ceremonial laws of the Mosaic polity in the seventh day."† And he is equally zealous with Luther in cautioning the people of not sinning against God by disregarding the moral obligations of this day.

Gerhard asks: "Why, in the New Testament, has the first day of the week been appointed in the place of the Jewish Sabbath?" And he answers: "It was set apart, by the apostles for the exercise of divine worship, chiefly on the ground that on this day Christ rose from the dead. There is a Christian Sabbath, since according to the constitution of the apostles, the first day of the week has been set apart for the public assemblies of the Church."‡

Calovius says: "The divine sanctification of the Sabbath both separates it from profane use, and consecrates it to sacred uses.

* * The two opinions (one that Christ, the other that the apostles changed it into the Lord's Day) are reconciled without difficulty, if we say that Christ by his resurrection on this day and by his example consecrated it, * * but the apostles, by the divine authority with which they were endowed, sanctified and instituted the first day of the week in the ordinary Christian Sabbath."‡

Further: "It ought not to be doubted that one day in seven has been retained by virtue of the divine commandment, only the Lord's Day has been substituted for the day of the Sabbath." "It is disputed," however, "whether Christ or the apostles substituted the Lord's Day, but all agree easily in this, *that the observance of the Lord's Day derives its validity not from custom alone or human constitution, but has been sanctified by divine constitution, since those things which the apostles sanctified by apostolic authority, are to be esteemed as divine institutions.*" And so Walch, whose introduction to the Symbolical Books has been styled a classic, says also of the Confession, after quoting its words: "If these words are so understood as if the Lord's

†Expos. Nicene Creed, Corpus Ref., xxiii., 565.

‡Loc. Theologici, xiii., 139.

‡Biblia Illustrata, i., 412-415.

Day was regarded by our fathers as a human institution, we confess they can by no means be approved. For, it is established beyond a doubt, that the celebration of the Lord's Day is not a human, but a divine institution." And so we might go on multiplying authority, but it is enough. From all the foregoing, we now proceed to draw our conclusions.

1. That the confessors and leading dogmatists uniformly held to a generic Creation Sabbath, which was universally and perpetually binding upon all men, and good for all time to come.

2. That the confessors held, that while the Sabbath was not necessary *ex opere operato* to salvation, *i. e.* its mere observance *per se* without faith in Christ was not saving, yet, it was necessary to the life of the "New Obedience" because it is a commandment of God which Article vi. enjoins upon us to obey.

3. That the confessors and leading dogmatists held, that while the ceremonial of the Sabbath was abolished, the remaining moral element of the third commandment was equally as binding upon the conscience as any of the other laws of the Decalogue.

4. That the confessors and leading dogmatists held, that the generic seventh of time, and not the specific seventh day, is the moral element of the third commandment which has not been abrogated, and which must abide for all time.

5. That the confessors and leading dogmatists held, that the change in the Sabbath from Jewish Sabbath to Lord's Day, was not made by human authority, or specifically by the authority of the Church, but by Christ and the apostles by virtue of the divine authority which they possessed as Lord and inspired apostles.

6. That the confessors and leading dogmatists held therefore, that the Lord's Day was not a human ordinance, but a divine institution.

7. That our General Synod is therefore in harmony with historical Lutheranism, and with the Lutheran understanding and interpretation of the Scriptures, when it says in official utterance that it "maintains the divine obligation of the Sabbath."

8. That ordination should not be given those who are not in harmony with this, her clearly defined position.

9. That the outcome and fruitage of the two interpretations given to the Confession—the one resulting in the Anglo-American Sabbath, the other in the Continental Sabbath—is itself God's own demonstration as to which is the true interpretation.

10. That in the recognition of the Sabbath as a divine institution lies the only hope of its better observance, and in a significant sense, the welfare and prosperity of God's kingdom which he has established here upon the earth.

ARTICLE IV.

SOUTHERN LITERATURE SINCE THE WAR.

BY REV. J. A. B. SCHERER, A. M.

NOTE.—Acknowledgment is made of especial assistance rendered by Stedman & Hutchinson's invaluable Library of American Literature, and Louise Manly's Southern Literature.

It has been difficult always to distinguish between ante- and post-bellum writers. For example, the literary activity of John Esten Cooke and Augusta Evans Wilson has extended to both periods. Generally, the principle of predominance was allowed to decide. Another and greater difficulty has been to determine whether certain authors are "Southern" or not. Lafcadio Hearn was born in Greece; Mrs. Barr, R. E. Mullany, and Mrs. Burnett are natives of Great Britain; but they are all recognized as American authors. Their American homes have been in the South; shall they then be claimed for Southern literature? Maurice Thompson, Northern born, fought in the Confederate army, but has for a long time been a Hoosier. Albert Pike went to the South and stayed there. M. D. Conway and Kate Field are native Southerners, but their sympathies and ties are Northern, as was the case with Allston. G. W. Cable and Mrs. S. M. B. Piatt were born in the South, but live in the North. An objection to Miss Manly's work is that it includes *all* of these in its list of Southern writers. The general principle followed in this paper is to classify post-bellum writers according to the locality where most of their work was produced, but in a few instances the distinctive flavor has decided. No hard and fast line can be drawn. It will be found that more doubtful cases are counted against the South than for it.

Completeness is not claimed for the lists of books given in the brief biographical sketches.

I.

A man once wrote a book. This man had in his youth been fostered by a Southern slaveholder, whose funds he subsequently appropriated, fleeing to the west and afterwards becoming famous as a "projector" and a south hater. The name of his parents was Helper, his book is *The Impending Crisis*. It is classed as literature, but this is probably due to its subject and its timeliness rather than to wisdom or to style. The book concerns us, briefly, in so far as it deals with the question of Southern literature before the war. It does not matter that Mr. Helper (as he names himself) calls the Southerners "helpless", nerveless, ignorant, selfish, yet vain-glorious, self-sufficient, and brutal;* nor that he pronounces "Southern literature a travesty upon the honorable profession of letters." Falsehoods do not make facts. But while discussing the subject of Southern literature, we may as well have the truth before us. It was the slaveholding South that gave Washington Allston to art; Audubon, Bachman, Mitchell, and Maury to science; Simms, Kennedy, the Tuckers, Ingraham and Augusta Wilson to fiction. From the ante-bellum South come the inimitable autobiography of Crockett, the histories of Byrd, Benton, and Gayarré, the biographies of Weems, Wirt, and Marshall, and the irresistible drolleries of Bagby. In journalism there was Prentice. In poetry, Key gave his country one of her grandest hymns, and Richard Henry Wilde set the measure for some of our most exquisite sonnets. Pinkney, Albert Pike, O'Hara, Legaré, and B. B. Cooke rank easily amongst the second-class poets, while Poe's fame is increasing with the years. The list is short enough, but it is not a "travesty," any more than the speeches of Hayne and Calhoun and Clay and Henry were travesties on oratory, or the patriotism of Taylor, Monroe, Madison, Jefferson, and Washington, was a travesty on statesmanship.

But it is not denied that the literary output of the old South

*A recent work, *A Girl's Life in Virginia before the War*, gives in true and simple language another side of Mr. Helper's picture. Better still, see Henry W. Grady on *The South before the War*, in "The New South," (*New York Ledger*, 1889).

was of limited quantity, especially when compared with the prolificness of that Eldorado of American letters, New England. Mr. Helper says that slavery was the cause of this, and perhaps it was. Certainly Southern literature since the war is richer in performance, but particularly in promise, than it was before. Moreover, it has a home audience. It was once the reproach of the South that eighty per cent. of her native books were bought by Northern readers. Mr. Helper wrote, in 1857, that "the people of the South are not a reading people." E. C. Stedman writes, in 1885: "I think that standard literature, including poetry, is read with more interest in the South than here."* Thus Southern literature now finds itself in possession of the first prerequisites of unstunted growth; gracious soil, and sunshine.

It has such rich stuff to feed upon; it is so fortunate in its theme. A recent writer says: "One of the most valuable literary movements in the United States in the last twenty years has been the effort to collect before too late the legends of the South, to interpret the spirit of the old plantation life, to preserve the types, the color, the atmosphere of a society that will always remain, artistically, one of the most fascinating in our history."† This is a movement that can properly be forwarded only by natives to the manner born; men and women whose nurses were mam-mies, whose playmates were pickaninies, whose landscapes are cotton fields and pines. That they love this dear old life, no one will deny; that they can speak their love in plain pure English is a happy fact. Passion and perspicuity are two of the strongest tools of literature. Fortunately, an ever-increasing body of Southerners manifest energy in the use of them.

Nor must it be thought that they all confine themselves to Southern themes. In both of the departments that we shall consider—namely, poetry and fiction—many artists have cared chiefly for their art, "and have believed its country to be universal, and that England, whose poets conspicuously avail themselves of the materials and atmosphere of other lands, should be

*Poets of America, p. 449.

†Ida M. Tarbell in *The Independent*, Nov. 21, 1895.

the last to lay down a law of restriction."* Thus, for the sake of convenience, Southern writers may be classed as cosmopolitan or provincial, according as they deal predominantly with general or with local subjects. It should be born in mind that the significance of this term, Provincial, extends solely to the theme, and that it might be so employed to characterize much of the work of Hawthorne or of Harte, for instance, without the slightest degree of disparagement, but rather otherwise.

Literature, in its technical sense, embraces the departments of poetry, fiction, history, biography, and essay. While limits are set forbidding this modest paper to pass beyond the consideration of the two principal branches, it must not therefore be presumed that Southern letters are weak in other fields. A mere mention of certain names will show that the story-teller and the minstrel are not alone in the march toward brighter days. Alexander H. Stevens,† Jefferson Davis,‡ E. A. Pollard,§ and W. G. McCabe|| wrote able histories of the war from their point of view, and recently Fitzhugh Lee produced a most valuable biography of his distinguished uncle. Charles Colcock Jones, Jr.,¶ has been a voluminous writer on historical subjects relating to the South, and Dr. J. L. M. Curry's** Southern States of the American Union (1895) will take rank as one of the best productions of its class. Prof. F. V. N. Painter's†† work in the history of Pedagogics is unsurpassed; good histories of Spain and of Greece have been written by Prof. Jas. A. Harrison; Molly Elliot Sewell‡‡ and Prof. Woodrow Wilson§§ are among the more prominent historical writers for the magazines.

*Poets of America, p. 54.

†The War between the States (1867, 1870); History of the United States.

‡The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government (1881).

§The Lost Cause, Lee and his Lieutenants, etc.

||The Defence of Petersburg, (1876), etc.

¶Historical Sketch of Tomo-Chi-Chi (1868), The Siege of Savannah in 1779 (1874), The History of Georgia (1883), etc.

**Author of Constitutional History of Spain, and "Gladstone."

††History of Education; Luther on Education; etc.

‡‡Paul Jones; Young Heroes of the Navy; Quarterdeck and Fok'sle; etc.

§§See Papers on George Washington, in *Harper's Monthly* for 1896.

In essay, Patrick F. Mullany may be named as representative.* Here may be also mentioned, for want of a better place, the excellent work of such journalists as Henry Watterson and H. W. Grady. Watterson (with Dana, Godkin, and McClure) is one of the few modern editors whose individuality is strong enough to retain for them a measure of the personal power formerly wielded by many of the greater journalists. Some of Grady's character sketches—not to speak of his oratory—entitle him to no mean place in American letters, and certainly no man has done more than he, both by word and pen, to make the North know the South as it is.

But we must pass on to consider the two fields to which this paper chiefly devotes itself.

II.

Of writers of cosmopolitan poetry—that is to say, limited by no predominant Southern theme—we may mention first a name that would grace the anthology of any age or nation; that of one who, like his spiritual kinsman, Keats, sang his last song far too soon, and yet left the world always sweeter for his singing. Sidney Lanier† was a poet born. It was in his nature to touch the soul of things, and then touch hearts. What shall we call this but just the poet's gift? He had delicacy without effeminacy, refinement without affectation, insight, not dissection, and force with no roughness. He had all this, but he had more. Nowadays, "departmental ditties" name a man for laureate,‡ and

**Philosophy of Literature* (1874); *Development of English Literature* (1880); *Address on Thinking* (1881); "Dante" and "Aristotle" (1886-7).

†Born Macon, Ga., Feb. 3, 1842; died Lynn, N. C., Sept. 7, 1891, of consumption. Soldier, lawyer, critic, musician, novelist, poet. Works: *Tiger-Lilies* (1867), *Science of English Verse* (1880), *Florida* (1876), *Centennial Ode* (1876), *Poems* (1887), *The Boy's Froissart* (1878), *The Boy's King Arthur* (1880), *The Boy's Mabinogian* (1881), *The Boy's Percy* (1882), and the *English Novel and the Principles of its Development* (1883). A collection of his poems, introduced by Wm. Hayes Ward, appeared in 1894. Representative poems are *The Marshes of Glynn*, *The Revenge of Hamish* ("than which there are few stronger ballads," says Stedman), *the Song of the Chattahoochee*, and *The Mocking-Bird*.

‡Rudyard Kipling was a nominee to succeed Tennyson!

anatomists of The Fleshly School are "poets." But literature will best hold record of those wise enough to win honey from nettles for us, truth from the treacherous marsh, and strength from a bruised heart. That is what Lanier did. He had a theory,* they tell us, that "led him to essay in language feats that only the gamut can render possible." But this theory was just the intellectual expression of his inborn poet's nature, and it was his *musical thought*† that made him a poet. A high sort of poetry is this musical kind, "which leads us to the edge of the infinite and lets us for moments gaze into that!" What better description than this of the effect produced by that marvelous song of "the length and the breadth and the sweep of" The Marshes of Glynn? That poem stands for all his best work, and in such vague way we purposely characterize, rather than analyze, what he did. We get powerful, definite *impressions*, and prefer to leave the knife aside. His work must be viewed as a whole: yet he was no mere impressionist. He seized always the essence of things, choosing now an outline, now details, choosing always that wherein the heart lay. In all his poetry he is in touch with the eternal. He leaves his mark forever on us, made as with a finger of light. In him we find a new strong soul whose memory we cannot lose. For, again, like that kindred child of nature who

* * "stood tiptoe upon a little hill,"

his was a gift that "penetrated into the inmost heart of the thing; detected the inmost mystery of it," and made us see or feel it with him. Here we may give only a specimen of his lighter work, but it well proves what has just been said. He is singing of the southern king of song, the mocking-bird.

Superb and sole, upon a plumèd spray
That o'er the general leafage boldly grew,
He summ'd the woods in song; or typic drew
The watch of hungry hawks, the lone dismay
Of languid doves when long their lovers stray,
And all birds' passion-plays that sprinkle dew
At morn in brake or bosky avenue.

*See his "Science of English Verse."

†Carlyle's definition of poetry. See *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, III.

Whate'er birds did or dreamed, this bird could say.
Then down he shot, bounced airily along
The sward, twitched in a grasshopper, made song
Midflight, perched, prinked, and to his art again.
Sweet science, this large riddle read me plain :
How may the death of that dull insect be
The life of yon trim Shakspeare on the tree?

We leave him with the words of one who loved him :*

The seas were not too deep for thee ; thine eye
Was comrade with the farthest star on high.
The marsh burst into bloom for thee,—
And still abloom shall ever be !
Its sluggish tides shall henceforth bear away
A charm it did not hold until thy day.

Paul Hamilton Haynes† has been called the laureate of the South. If that is so, the South is not ashamed. There have been lesser laureates. And if Lanier's favorite saying on art be true,—that "beauty is holiness, and holiness is beauty"—then Hayne is a laureate, for his verse (like his life) shows strongly the beauty of holiness. He was one of those rare writers whose lovely character indelibly shows through their work, adding goodness to genius, making their poems psalms. If Lanier was akin to Keats, Hayne is a Southern Longfellow. Nor does his *Lyric of Action* in the least suffer by comparison with the *Psalm of Life*.

The relation between Hayne and Lanier is not unlike that of Longfellow and Lowell. On the one hand, Lowell had the more passion, a greater and a unique genius ; on the other hand, Longfellow was the steadier, the always serious. Lanier was like that sounding stream in the mountains, like his own Chat-tahoochee chanting its songs to the hills ; Hayne is this quiet river in the meadow. There is wide and welcoming room for each.

*Waitman Barbe (himself a southern poet) in *Ashes and Incense*, of which E. C. Stedman says: "There is real poetry in the book—a voice worth owning and exercising."

†Born Charleston, S. C., Jan. 1, 1830; died in Georgia, 1886. Lawyer, editor, soldier, biographer, poet. A complete edition of his poems (previously published in five separate editions) appeared in 1882. He wrote the *Life of Robert Y. Hayne* (1878), and the *Life of Hugh S. Legare* (1878).

Much richness of color is found in Hayne, and fine sense of rhythm. He has the true poetical instinct for suiting his meter to his meaning. In this richness of coloring and this metrical intuition he sometimes reminds us of Shelley, though there are many more points of contrast than of likeness. He sighs of October, when

The passionate summer's dead ! the sky's aglow
With roseate flushes of matured desires,
The winds at eve are musical and low,
As sweeping chords of a lamenting lyre.

Shelley sobs of autumn, when

The warm sun is failing, the bleak wind is wailing,
The bare boughs are sighing, the pale flowers are dying
And the year
On the earth her death-bed, in a shroud of leaves dead,
Is lying.

Yes, Shelley had by far the greater genius, but his music is all in minors. The beauty of Hayne is the beauty of holiness. To Shelley, "the bleak winds are wailing;" to Hayne, the same winds are "musical and low." For Hayne hears the South wind; Shelley, the West.

"O wild west wind,"

he cries,

* * "Be thou, spirit fierce,
My spirit ! Be thou me, impetuous one !"

Sings the southern poet, rapturously,

O fresh, how fresh and fair
Through the crystal gulfs of air,
The fairy South Wind floateth on her subtle wings of balm !
And the green earth lapped in bliss,
To the magic of her kiss
Seems yearning upward fondly through the golden-crested calm.

So the words of Mrs. Margaret J. Preston seem almost justified when she write: "There is no poet in America who has written more lovingly or discriminatingly about nature in her ever varying aspects. We are sure that in his loyal allegiance to her, he is not a whit behind Wordsworth, and we do not hesitate to say that he has often a grace that the old Lake-poet lacks." John Payne Collier says: "Hayne has the lyric gift,

and his shorter poems have a ring and richness that recall the glories of the Elizabethan period." There is no better fruit of this lyric gift than this inspiring Lyric of Action:

'Tis the part of a coward to brood
O'er the past that is withered and dead:
What though the heart's roses are ashes and dust?
What though the heart's music be fled?
Still shine the grand heavens o'erhead,
Whence the voice of an angel thrills clear on the soul,
"Gird about thee thine armor, press on to the goal."

If the faults or crimes of thy youth
Are a burden too heavy to bear,
What hope can rebloom on the desolate waste
Of a jealous and craven despair?
Down, down with the fetters of fear!
In the strength of thy valor and manhood arise,
With the faith that illumines and the will that defies.

Too late! Through God's infinite world,
From his throne to life's nethermost fires,
Too late is a phantom that flies at the dawn
Of the soul that repents and aspires.
If pure thou hast made thy desires,
There's no height the strong wings of immortals may gain
Which in striving to reach, thou shalt strive for in vain.

Then up to the contest with fate,
Unbound by the past which is dead!
What though the heart's roses are ashes and dust?
What though the heart's music be fled?
Still shine the fair heavens o'erhead;
And sublime as the angel that rules in the sun
Beams the promise of peace when the conflict is won!

The women of the South, long noted for their grace, beauty, and refinement, have had full share in the recent revival of letters. In their work we find these same three charms. Perhaps none of them is more widely known than Mrs. Margaret J. Preston,* whose productions, both in prose and poetry, always,

*Born in Philadelphia, 1825, removing to Virginia in 1848. Says Arthur Stedman: "Mrs. Preston, though a Northerner by birth, always was identified as a writer with the South." Her works are: *Silverwood*, a novel (1856); *Beechenbrook*, a Rhyme of the War (1866); *Old Songs and New* (1870); *Cartoons* (1875); *For Love's Sake* (1887); *Colonial Ballads* (1887); etc.

like Hayne's, "breathe forth a sweet and wise influence." Stedman pronounces her a pupil of Browning, with "dramatic purpose and expression." The best example in her work both of dramatic force and of Browning's influence is a kinetoscopic dialogue entitled *The Hero of the Commune*. It is as a religious writer that Mrs. Preston is best known. She concludes one of her sweetest songs with this beautiful verse :

There'll come a day—I shall not care how passes
The cloud across my sight,
If only, lark-like, from earth's nested grasses,
I spring to meet its light.*

Of a very ethereal and genuinely poetic quality is the best work of Mrs. Danske Dandridge.† This quality is so fine that, despite its limitation in quantity, her work merits attention even here. There is a certain eeriness about her themes that recalls the poet's far northern birth, hinting even of legends strange to Southern ears, but no less winning. The style is remarkable for its smooth flow and natural expression; Wordsworth himself could ill find fault with such clearness and ease of structure. There is, moreover, only a happy suggestiveness of truth in place of the bald didacticism of the Lake school. Her poems are not at once postscripted and proscribed by a "Moral;" yet the moral is there, winsome though being veiled. The general poetic effect often suggests such masterpieces as "*Annabel Lee*" and "*The Cloud*." This may be indicated by citing the opening stanzas of *The Dead Moon* :

We are ghost-ridden;
Through the deep night
Wanders a spirit,
Noiseless and white.
Loiters not, lingers not, knoweth no rest;
Ceaselessly haunting the East and the West.
She, whose undoing the ages have wrought,
Moves on to the time of God's rhythmical thought.
In the dark, swinging sea,
As she speedeth through space,

*See also p. 508.

†Born Copenhagen, Denmark, 1859. Removed to West Virginia in 1877. Author of *Joy, and Other Poems* (1888).

She reads her pale image;
 The wounds are agape on her face,
 She sees her grim nakedness
 Pierced by the eyes
 Of the spirits of God
 In their flight through the skies.
 (Her wounds, they are many and hollow.)
 The earth turns and wheels as she flies,
 And this Spectre, this Ancient, must follow.

A more beautiful poem is entitled *The Spirit and the Wood Sparrow*. Certainly there is wide promise in such a writer, still so young.

The South is fortunate in possessing a school of young poets whose early work—chiefly in the magazines—is a rich earnest of good things yet to come. Such a one is Samuel Minturn Peck,* whom *The Independent*† justly calls “a genuine song-singer, simple, warm, magnetic.” This critical authority—probably the highest among American journals—says further of our author that “his poetry appeals to the heart. His song, the ‘Grapevine Swing,’ has captivated the ear of a large audience with its tenderness and grace. * * No one does better than this Tuskaloosa minstrel. His songs sing themselves.” So they do. Without ambitious pretensions, these verses have a simplicity, a warmth, and a sweetness that endear them to the people everywhere. It is the same charming talent that characterizes the work of James Whitcomb Riley and Eugene Field. Other writers receive a higher praise, but none are better loved. What father can read these verses without loving the man that wrote them?

MY LITTLE GIRL.

My little girl is nested
 Within her tiny bed,
 With amber ringlets crested
 Around her dainty head;
 She lies so calm and stilly,
 She breathes so soft and low,

*Born in Tuskaloosa, Ala., Nov. 4, 1854. Farmer, physician, poet. Works: *Rings and Love-Knots*; *Cap and Bells* (1886)—now in its sixth edition; and *Rhymes and Roses* (1895).

†Dec. 5, 1895.

She calls to mind a lily
Half-hidden in the snow.

A weary little mortal
Has gone to slumberland;
The Pixies at the portal
Have caught her by the hand;
She dreams her broken dolly
Will soon be mended there,
That looks so melancholy
Upon the rocking-chair.

I kiss your wayward tresses,
My drowsy little queen;
I know you have caresses
From floating forms unseen.
O, Angels, let me keep her
To kiss away my cares,
This darling little sleeper,
Who has my love and prayers.

There is no sweeter thing in American literature, in its way, than a little poem on *The Death of Winter*, by Robert Burns Wilson.* He has the same light fancy of Minturn Peck, with dramatic quality added. The song shows Spring pillowing the old man's dying head,—

And when the strong life faded, on her breast,
Her own soft tears fell down like heavenly dew.

O ye sweet blossoms of the whispering lea,
Ye fair, frail children of the woodland wide,
Ye are the fruit of that dear love which she
Did give to wounded Winter ere he died.

And some are tinted like her eyes of blue,
Some hold the blush that on her cheek did glow,
Some from her lips have caught their scarlet hue,
But more still keep the whiteness of the snow.†

*Born in Washington county, Pa., Oct. 30, 1850. Early removed to Frankfort, Ky. Painter and poet. His collected poems, *Life and Love*, appeared in 1887.

†A deeper note is struck in these sombre opening lines on "An Evening" (*Century Magazine*, Nov. 1894):

Cloud-gloomed, the colorless, disheartened day
Hath wept itself to death: the fitful wind,
Upstarting wildly, like some haunted mind,
Sweeps through the dripping thicket, and away
Across the darkening fields.

The dedication of his book of poems—"To Elizabeth, my Mother"—has room in every heart.

The green Virginian hills were blithe in May,
And we were plucking violets—thou and I.
A transient gladness flooded earth and sky;
Thy fading strength seemed to return that day,
And I was mad with hope that God would stay
Death's pale approach—Oh! all hath long passed by!
Long years! long years! and now, I well know why
Thine eyes, quick-filled with tears, were turned away.
First loved; first lost; my mother: time must still
Leave my soul's debt uncanceled. All that's best
In me and in my art is thine:—Me-seems
Even now, we walk afield. Through good and ill,
My sorrowing heart forgets not, and in dreams,
I see thee, in the sun-lands of the blest.

The most recent of all these strong young minstrels is Henry Jerome Stockard, of North Carolina. Frank L. Stanton, a talented staff writer on *The Atlanta Constitution*, pronounces his sonnets the best that appear in that stately treasure-house of American letters, *The Century Magazine*. Certainly he deserves his place beside Gilder and Boner and Wilson. It is fit to close this department of our subject as it was opened, with a song to a Southern mocking-bird. For this little gem is worthy of a setting even with the polished workmanship of Sidney Lanier. It ranks with the lines of Browning, in "Home thoughts from Abroad," which Stedman thinks are "the finest ever written touching the song of a bird."*

TO A MOCKING-BIRD.

The name thou wearest does thee grievous wrong:
No mimic thou; that voice is thine alone.
The poets sing but strains of Shakspeare's song;
The birds, but notes of thine imperial own.†

*"That's the wise thrush: he sings each song twice over
Lest you should think he never could recapture
The first fine careless rapture!"

† *The Century Magazine*, Oct. 1894. Worthy of a place here is a bright quatrain on the same theme by Wm. Hamilton Hayne, the son of Lanier's great contemporary:

Each golden note of music greets
The listening leaves divinely stirred,

Other poets of the cosmopolitan class (not mentioned either in the text or in the notes) are Clifford Lanier, Madison J. Cawein, John B. Tabb, James Barron Pope, Daniel Bedinger Lucas, and Mary E. Bryan.

III.

Post-bellum poets whose themes have been exclusively or predominantly Southern may be divided into two classes—those brought out or developed by the war, and those later ones whose joy it has been to paint the scenes of peace. Of the former, Prof. H. A. Beers pronounces Henry Timrod* most noteworthy.

The same is now generally believed in the South, though proper recognition was long in coming. Like many of the better poets, he was ahead of his time. His handiwork is "skillful, imaginative, and strong." It suggests the method of Lanier, with whom, indeed, Timrod had no little in common. The saddest likeness is their early death. In this way the South has been peculiarly unfortunate. But enough of Timrod remains to fix for him a firm place in literary annals.

His sweetest song is that of English "Katie." Among his best war poems are "Charleston," and the "Unknown Dead." He composed a fine hymn for use at the consecration of the Magnolia Cemetery, in his native city. But the most characteristic poem is *The Cotton Boll*, which serves well to show his artistic affinity with Lanier. The opening passage is as follows:

While I recline
At ease beneath
This immemorial pine,
Small sphere!
(By dusky fingers brought this morning here
And shown with boastful smiles),
I turn thy cloven sheath,
Through which the soft white fibres peer,

As if the vanished soul of Keats
Had found its new birth in a bird.

—*The Century Magazine*, Sep. 1893.

Compare also the ode by Albert Pike.

*Born Charleston, S. C., Dec. 8, 1829; died Columbia, S. C., Oct. 6, 1867. Lawyer, teacher, journalist, poet. His poems were published in 1860, and again (edited by R. H. Hayne) in 1873.

That, with their gossamer bands,
Unite, like love, the sea-divided lands,
And slowly, thread by thread,
Draw forth the folded strands,
Than which the trembling line,
By whose frail help yon startled spider fled
Down the tall spear-grass from his swinging bed,
Is scarce more fine;
And as the tangled skein
Unravels in my hands,
Betwixt me and the noonday light
A veil seems lifted, and for miles and miles
The landscapes broadens on my sight,
As, in the little boll, there lurked a spell
Like that which, in the ocean shell,
With mystic sound
Breaks down the narrow walls that hem us round,
And turns some city lane
Into the restless main,
With all his capes and isles!

A number of poets of this period are memorable chiefly for their war songs. James Ryder Randall, who is still living, will always be remembered for "Maryland my Maryland," called the Marseillaise of the Confederacy. It was composed in 1861, and set by Mrs. Burton Harrison to the tune of Lauriger Horatius, "on the wings of which it quickly flew all over the South." Abram Joseph Ryan, (familiarily known as "Father Ryan," the poet-priest) is famous as the author of the "Conquered Banner" and the "Sword of Lee," though he produced other poems of merit. Albert Pike, whose fine work was chiefly done before the war, composed the best one of the many songs known as Dixie.* W. G. McCabe, educator and historian, wrote "Dreaming in the Trenches," and other war verses. John R. Thompson† commemorated in worthy verse the two cavalry heroes, Ashby and Stuart, and narrates a most beautiful incident of the war in his spirited ballad, *Music in Camp*. He tells how the

*The Bivouac of the Dead, a poem by Theo. O'Hara, often regarded as a song of the Civil War, was written in 1847, in memory of the Kentuckians that fell at Buena Vista.

†Born Richmond, Va., Oct. 23, 1823; died in New York, Apr. 30, 1873. Lawyer, editor. poet. His works have never been collected.

bands of the two hostile armies, which were encamped at evening on opposite banks of the same river, vied with each other in sectional music, until at last deep peace and reverie succeeded the strains of "Home, Sweet Home." Mrs. Preston has paid tribute to him in a poem on his grave, of which the concluding stanza is as follows:

"Think of the thousand mellow rhymes,
The pure idyllic passion-flowers,
Wherewith, in far-gone, happier times,
He garlanded this South of ours.
Provençal-like, he wandered long.
And sang at many a stranger's board,
Yet 'twas Virginia's name that poured
The tenderest pathos through his song.
We owe the poet praise and tears,
Whose ringing ballad sends the brave
Bold Stuart riding down the years—
What have we given him? Just a grave!

Now we shall speak of a few of those later poets who, filled with the song gift and also with strong affection for the everyday scenes of their sunny land, have won both love and fame by singing what Whitcomb Riley would call "poems here at home." Mrs. Mary A. Townsend,* under the pen-name of Xariffa, has written of the far South. Her best known poem, *Down the Bayou*, is a picture without painting. As the lovers drift down the lagoon, we see as with our own eyes that panorama with a cathedral spire fading into the azure sky, while in the foreground mingle brilliant masses of luxuriant vegetation, among which the saurian lies sunning; through which the serpent steals.

Like some blind Homer of the wood,—
A king in beggared solitude,—
Upon the wide, palmettoed plain,
A giant cypress here and there
Stood in impoverished despair;
With leafless crown, with outstretched limbs,

*Mary Ashley Townsend (Van Voorhis), was born in New York State, 1832 (1836?), but removed to New Orleans. Delivered opening poem at the New Orleans exposition in 1884. Works: *The Brother Clerks* (1859); *Poems* (1870); *The Captain's Story* (1874); *Down the Bayou and Other Poems* (1882).

With mien of woe, with voiceless hymns,
 With mossy raiment, tattered, gray,
 Waiting in dumb and sightless pain,
 A model posing for Doré.
 Aloft, on horizontal wing,
 We saw the buzzard rock and swing;
 That sturdy sailor of the air,
 Whose agile pinions have a grace
 That prouder plumes might proudly wear,
 And claim for it a kinglier race.

What "Xariffa" did for Louisiana, John Henry Boner* has done for the Carolinas. His work is largely "cosmopolitan," as witness many fine sonnets in the current magazines. But he is at his best when strolling among the "whispering pines" of his youth, or when seated in front of a wide hearth of blazing "light'ood." Such a sweet home touch is his sonnet on The Light'ood Fire that we give it here in full:

When wintry days are dark and drear
 And all the forest ways grow still,
 When gray snow-laden clouds appear
 Along the bleak horizon hill,
 When cattle all are snugly penned
 And sheep go huddling close together,
 When steady streams of smoke ascend
 From farm-house chimneys—in such weather
 Give me old Carolina's own,
 A great log house, a great hearthstone,
 A cheering pipe of cob or briar
 And a red, leaping light'ood fire.

When dreary day draws to a close
 And all the silent land is dark,
 When Boreas down the chimney blows
 And sparks fly from the crackling bark,
 When limbs are bent with snow or sleet
 And owls hoot from the hollow tree,
 With hounds asleep about your feet,
 Then is the time for reverie.
 Give me old Carolina's own,
 A hospitable wide hearthstone,
 A cheering pipe of cob or briar
 And a red, rousing light'ood fire.

*Born Salem, N. C., Jan. 31, 1845. Editor and poet. Member of the staffs of two of the most valuable and monumental works ever produced in the United States—the Century Dictionary and The Library of American Literature. Frequent contributor to the magazines. "Whispering Pines," poems, appeared in 1883.

John Alfred Macon* is one who, like Mrs. Preston, the Laniers, and others, has diligently cultivated the art of writing plantation verse. Through him Uncle Remus talks in rhymes—and excellent rhyming it is, too. As pointed out by our foremost American critic, this sort of work is an outgrowth of the cisatlantic muse sufficiently original to satisfy the most querulous Quiller-Couch that wears an eye-glass.† Of late years Mr. Macon has assumed a style of greater dignity and less value. Here is a choice bit of political philosophy entitled Politics at the Log Rolling.

I blebes dat any nigger's in a sorry sort o' way
 Dat swallows all de racket dat de politicians say;
 For I's been a grown-up cullud man some forty years or so,
 An' I's heard 'em make de same old 'sertions heap o' times befo'.
 Dar's lots o' cussed foolishness an' gassin', anyway,
 'Bout bustin' up de Consterchusion eb'ry 'lection-day;
 'Cause I gib it as de notion ob a plain an' humble man,
 Dat de Gub'ment an' de country, too, is tough enough to stan'.
 I nebber takes more polertics den one good man kin tote,
 An' I don't need any 'visin' when I go to drap my vote;
 I talks wid all de canerdates, an' tell 'em what I choose,
 But I goes in on de side dat gibs de *biggest bobbykews*!

Frank L. Stanton has written poetry of merit.

Thus a line of tuneful younger Southrons has passed in rapid review before us. In their verse there may be little of "the grand style;" but there is nothing sickly, and nothing sour, and nothing fleshly. These poems breathe the spirit of a fair old land made new. "The great heart of the generous and lonely South, too long restrained,—of the South once so prodigal of romance, eloquence, gallant aspiration,—once more has found expression. It enables us to know it, having at last begun to comprehend its true self."‡

IV.

Retaining for the sake of convenience the same distinctions hitherto employed, we may name "Christian Reid"§ as one of

*Born Demopolis, Ala., Nov. 15, 1851. Journalist; dialect writer. "Uncle Gabe Tucker" appeared in 1881.

†Poets of America, p. 455.

‡E. C. Stedman, Poets of America, p. 451.

§Frances C. Tiernan (Fisher), was born in Salisbury, N. C., where all

post-bellum pioneers in cosmopolitan fiction. Her stories are good examples of the older romantic type, undisfigured by the fine writing common to many women novelists of the same school. Her best work, *The Land of the Sky*, is a lucid, strong description of the magnificent mountain scenery of her native State. *The Land of the Sun*, appearing in 1895, does much the same service for Mexico.

Equally distinguished in a newer school is Mrs. Burton Harrison,* who began her highly successful career with charming stories of colonial life in Virginia, but is now best known as a clever and keen rebuker of American social folly. The Anglo-manians announces its own purpose. *Sweet Bells Out of Tune* is a humiliating exposure of the laxness of marriage, and *A Bachelor Maid* deals with the "new woman." Perhaps there has never been a more delightful combination of love-tale and travel than in *An Errant Wooing*. Mrs. Harrison's style is polished and pleasing, her satire unmalicious, her influence excellent.

Miss Julia Magruder† writes popular stories for women. Her work has little other purpose than to amuse, conforming thus to Mr. Bunner's theory that a tale should be told for the telling. Of the same sort is the work of Miss M. G. McClelland,‡ which contains some powerful passages, notably the flood scene in "Oblivion."

of her literary work has been done. Her many novels include: *Valerie Aylmer*, *Mabel Lee*, *Nina's Atonement*, *Carmen's Inheritance*, *Hearts and Hands*, *Heart of Steel*, *Summer Idyl*, *Roslyn's Fortune*, *Morton House*, *Ebb Tide*, *Daughter of Bohemia*, *A Gentle Belle*, *A Question of Honor*, *After Many Days*, *Bonny Kate*, *Armine*, *Miss Churchill*. Two books of travel are *The Land of the Sky*, and *The Land of the Sun*.

*Born in Virginia, 1835 (Constance Cary). Novels: *The Anglomaniacs*, *Flower de Hundred*, *Bellhaven Tales*, *My Lord Fairfax*, *Sweet Bells*, *Out of Tune*, *A Bachelor Maid*, *An Errant Wooing*, etc.

†Born in Virginia, 1854. Novels: *Across the Chasm*, *At Anchor*, *Honored in the Breach*, *A Magnificent Plebeian*, *A Beautiful Alien*, *The Princess Sonia*, etc. Has lately written "Child Sketches from George Eliot."

‡Born Norwood, Va., Novels: *Norwood*, *White Heron*, *Eleanor Gwynn*, *Oblivion* (1885), *Princess* (1886), *Jean Monteith* (1887), *Madame Silva* (1888), and *Burkett's Lock* (1889).

Perhaps the most talented of all these brilliant woman is Miss Amelie Rives,* whose early work gave the richest promise. A Brother to Dragons and companion stories were charming tales of Shakspeare's time, powerfully written in choice old English. Unhappily, "The Quick or the Dead?" was a piece of erotic sensationalism, from the ill effects of which Miss Rives's literary reputation never recovered. It was followed by a maudlin story of morphine and mortuary, leaving the young author's friends sorely disappointed, yet treasuring her early work as it deserves.

Lafcadio Hearn† is usually classed as a Southern writer, though he has lived all over the world. "Chita; a Memory of Last Island" contains some exceedingly strong word painting. Indeed, the author is a prose poet. His books of travel, while valueless for truth, are examples of style as artistic as can be found in any prose save Ruskin's.

The list closes with the name of Francis Hopkinson Smith,‡ a man of versatile talent best turned to account in fiction. His most widely known work is Col. Carter of Cartersville, a delightful story of the old-time Southerner. His recent creation of Major Tom Slocomb in "A Vagabond Gentleman" has elicited warm praise, but the strongest work he has done is the delineation of "Tom Grogan," amazon of the tenements.

*Born Richmond, Va., Aug. 23, 1863. Married 1888 to John A. Chanler, subsequently divorced. Her works include: A Brother to Dragons, Nurse Crummet Tells the Story, The Farrier Lass o' Piping Pebworth, Virginia of Virginia, The Quick or the Dead?—all published in 1888; Herod and Mariamne, a drama, 1889; According to Saint John (1890), Athelwood, Barbara Dering, Story of Arnon, Witness of the Sun, Tanis, etc.

†Born in the Ionian Islands, June 27, 1850. Subsequently resided in New Orleans, now in Japan. His books comprise: Stray Leaves from Strange Literature (1885); Some Chinese Ghosts (1887); Chita (1889); Two years in the French West Indies (1890); Youma (1890); Glimpses of Unfamiliar Japan (1894); Out of the East (1895); he has been a frequent contributor to the *Atlantic Monthly*.

‡Born in Baltimore, Oct. 23, 1838. Painter, art critic, civil engineer, and novelist. Among his works are: Old Lines in New Black and White (1885); Well-worn Roads (1886); A Book of the Tile Club (1886); A White Umbrella in Mexico (1889); Col. Carter of Cartersville (1891); A Day at Laguerre's (1892); American Illustrators (1892); A Vagabond Gentleman and Some Others (1895); Tom Grogan (1896).

V.

With this hasty survey, we pass on to review the writers whose privilege it has been to see the life of the old South before it dissolves in dull universal uniformity, and to paint it with the cunning of lovers.

A link between the old and the new, John Esten Cooke* is chiefly memorable for his romantic stories of the war. Himself an active soldier, gifted with fertile and ambitious imagination, he has written novels as thrilling as any in our whole line of literature. Indeed they are at times sensational. Again, there is a tedious sameness in them that always marks forced tension and fine writing. All of his women are dazzlingly beautiful; every soldier "sits his horse." But, though the coloring is high, the pictures are on the whole pleasing and true. Some passages of these books, obviously penned under a high enthusiasm, are sublime in pathos and passion; as the eulogy on "Lee's Misérables" in *Mohun*.

"Marion Harland"† occupies much the same place here as "Christian Reid" in another field. Her stories are of the older South, composed in the older style. They are pervaded by a spirit of tender and harmless romance.

There has at no time arisen in the South a stronger novelist than George Washington Cable.‡ In him we come to consider that large class of gifted writers whose talents have been devo-

*Born Winchester, Va., Nov. 3, 1830. Died Boyce, Va., Sept. 27, 1886. Lawyer, soldier, and novelist. Works: *Leather Stocking and Silk* (1854); *Henry St. John* (1859); *Surrey of Eagle's Nest* (1866); *Mohun*, a sequel; *Hilt to Hilt* (1869); *Hammer and Rapier*; *The Virginia Bohemians* (1880); *The Maurice Mystery* (1885); *lives of Lee and Jackson*; etc., etc.

†Mary Virginia Terhune (Hawes), was born in Amelia Co., Va., 183-. Has resided in the North since 1859. Domestic writer and novelist. Has written *The Story of Mary Washington*; *Alone* (1853); *Miriam* (1860); *Judith* (1883); etc.

‡Born in New Orleans, Oct. 12, 1844. Removed North in 1885. Soldier, journalist, and novelist. His writings include: *Old Creole Days* (1879-'83); *The Grandissimes* (1880); *Dr. Sevier* (1883); *The Creoles of La.* (1884); *The Silent South* (1885); *Bonaventure* (1888); *Stories of La.* (1889); *The Negro Question* (1890); *Life of Wm. Gilmore Simms* (1890); *John March, Southerner* (1894).

ted to the literary portrayal of certain sections. Rudyard Kipling in India, Crawford in Rome, Bret Harte among the miners, Miss Wilkins in New England, and, very recently, Mr. Wister with the cow-boys—as great as any of these is Cable telling of the Creoles. But let him once forsake his last and try reform; or let him once leave home and try Virginia (as with his John March, Southerner), and we will have none of him! To see him at his best, one must see him at home. There he has the delicacy, the perception, the wit of a woman; but effeminacy, not a whit. We can never forget the two Mossys, father and son, nor yet dear old Pas-Trop-Bon, with his foster children. It is doubtful if Mr. Cable has ever done anything better than this short story of Pas-Trop-Bon, "The Taxidermist." As a character sketch, it ranks with the best work of Dickens, and is without grotesqueness. Thus as in all his better stories he tells us of that strange old creole life; of that little old-world in the big new; we that understand him follow with smiles and tears, as he leads.

Of late years he has been joined by Miss Grace King.* Her creole stories are earnest and artistic, but she has given us only the shadows. Very clear-cut shadows they are (with no penumbra); strange and strong, but they make us long for the light. There is much dramatic force in this new pen; can it use no ink but tears?

For Kentucky, James Lane Allen,† has lately begun to do rich service. Previously, Kentucky had no recognized place in fiction. Several authors had made it the scene of their stories, but with no local color. Mr. Allen is therefore a pioneer, and his State could not wish a better. He is no mere chronicler of early scenes. He has a subtle power of transfiguration that gives to his work an inseparably poetic aspect. A discerning critic has said that this power, coupled with strict adherence to

*Born in New Orleans. Her works include: *Bonne Maman* (1886); *Monsieur Motte* (1888); *Earthlings* (1889); *Bayou L'Ombre*; *Balcony Stories*.

†His works include: *Life in the Blue Grass*; *The White Cowl*; *Flute and Violin*; *John Gray*; *Sister Dolorosa*; *A Kentucky Cardinal*; *Aftermath*.

underlying reality, makes his stories unlike those of any other writer.* They have found a large and appreciative audience.

"Charles Egbert Craddock"† has been longer known as the revealer of mountain life in East Tennessee. She has great imaginative, dramatic and descriptive ability. At times her pictures seem slightly overdrawn: "She is an artist with a deep and changeless faith in the efficacy of descriptive gorgeousness." But there are few abler fiction specialists. Most of her work has a somber tint, doubtless because it is true to the life it portrays. She makes frequent and skillful use of dialect. Besides being of choice literary value, her stories inspire understanding readers with strong sympathy and enthusiasm. A new comer in the same field is Mr. John Fox, Jr.,‡ whose "Mountain Europa" has a tender charm, a delicate and enduring pathos no words at second hand can convey. Mr. Howells finds his "vision and touch * * clearer and more direct" than Miss Murfree's, but this finding may in part be due to the realistic prejudices of the judge.

Harry Stillwell Edwards§ is one of the prose laureates of Georgia. His style is delightfully simple and true, abounding in pathos and humor. It is an idealized transcript of Georgia life. Some of his best work is in dialect, as witness the Nubian debate in *The Century* for September, 1895. He has done nothing better than "A Battle in Crackerdom," a story that touches the depth of pathos and the heights of moral beauty. In his own particular field Mr. Edwards is unequalled.

**Harper's Weekly*, Dec. 21, 1895.

†Mary Noailles Murfree, born near Murfreesboro', Tenn.; but now resides in St. Louis. Her books include: *In the Tennessee Mountains* (1884); *Where the Battle Was Fought* (1884); *Down the Ravine* (1885); *The Prophet of the Great Smoky Mountains* (1885); *In the Clouds* (1886); *The Story of Keedon Bluffs* (1887); *The Despot of Broomsedge Cove* (1888); etc.

‡*A Cumberland Vendetta, and Other Stories* (1885).

§Born Macon, Ga., April 23, 1854. Lawyer and journalist. "Two Runaways, and Other Stories" was published in 1889. His work appears frequently in the *Century Magazine*.

So is Richard Malcolm Johnston* in his. The writer of these lines long ago succumbed to him in the pages of *St. Nicholas*, and even now he knows no better antidote for a rainy day than *The Historic Doubts of Riley Hood*, or *Mr. Ebenezer Bull's Investments*. As a humorist the genial gray-haired Georgian is unsurpassed. There is no trace of coarseness about his work, and nothing forced. He tells his funny backwoods tales in the simplest way imaginable, and the effect is irresistible. They have a flavor of homespun truth that will outlast some of "Mr. Ward's" grotesqueries, much of "Mark Twain's" absurdities, and all of "Bill Nye's" blather. For they are real pictures of a real people, who are, all unconsciously, as funny as one could find.

Still another Georgian remains, he the most famous of them all. Critics may call it *Marinism*† if they will; but a very large class of readers will always be grateful to the best among the writers of dialect. Philosophers have said that language is the great revealer of racial characteristics. On this belief philology is founded. Are not dialects to any one language what that language is to all others? Is there not something lost of a people's life unless we know just *how* they talk? The popular work of Crockett or of "Ian McLaren" would lose much of its charm if you took away its "Marinistic" Scotticisms. So the negro is better understood and appreciated than he ever could have been without the phonographic ear and sympathetic hand of some master friend like Joel Chandler Harris.‡ Besides being richly amusing, this author's work has high value in folk-lore literature. He has shown, in his prefaces, that all the stories are genuine, and that they probably came from Africa. In this we get

*Born in Hancock Co., Ga., March, 8, 1822. Lawyer, educator, storyteller. *Dukesborough Tales* (1883); *Biography of A. H. Stephens* (1883); *Old Mark Langston* (1884); *Two Gray Tourists* (1885); *Mr. Absalom Billingslea* (1887); *Ogeechee Cross-Firings* (1889); etc.

†See Sherman's *Analytics of Literature*, pp. 339, 340.

‡Born Eatonton, Ga., Dec. 9, 1848. Journalist. His works include: *Uncle Remus, His Songs and His Sayings* (1880, 1895); *Mingo* (1883); *Nights with Uncle Remus* (1884); *Free Joe* (1888); *Daddy Jake* (1889); *Uncle Remus and His Friends* (1892); *Balaam and His Master*; *On the Plantation*; *Little Mr. Thimblefinger*; etc.

glimpses of a world unknown, and filled with mystery. But the chief value of what Mr. Harris has done is in Uncle Remus himself. With the coming of the school to his boys, he goes away. A few years hence, and book lids will hold for us all that remains of the dear old plantation darkey, so loved by all that knew him, so misunderstood by such as have only heard. A helpful thing this biographer has done, then, to give us such living pictures of old Remus, with his devotion and wit and big-ness of heart, telling with his own tongue his ancient weird tales. Mr. Harris also knows how to tell strong stories without the use of dialect, as appears in "Free Joe" and like sketches. He richly deserves the magnificent *édition de luxe* just published.

If ever stories in dialect can be called classic, Thomas Nelson Page* has written them. Two of his pieces are as exquisitely beautiful in sentiment and workmanship as any short stories we have—"Marse Chan" and "Meh Lady." Mr. Page has done much else of merit, but it is doubtful whether he can ever again approach these fine first efforts. It is hard to choose between them. In both there is the same strong theme of love, the same enduring beauty of devotion, the same overwhelming pathos succeeding smiles. These two stories, at least, will not meet the early fate of most dialect work. They have in them that which is lasting and living, so long as the South is alive.

There remain several talented women writers whose names have not been noted. First among these is Mrs. Ruth McEnery Stuart, whose recent work for the magazines has been particularly good. The best of this is done in monologue. It is well worth while to hear that lank old sentimental farmer tell how his "Christmas Guest" came; how, later, that guest, in the shape of "The Boy," took despotic possession as only boys can. With a different but no less delightful flavor, Mrs. Stuart joins

*Born Hanover Co., Va., April 23, 1853. Lawyer and author. Marse Chan first appeared in the *Century Magazine* in 1884. Some of his books are: *In Ole Virginia* (1887); *Two Little Confederates* (1888); *Befo' de War* (1888, in collaboration with A. C. Gordon); *Elsket, and Other Stories*; *On New Found River*; *Pastime Stories*; *Among the Camps*.

Col. Johnston in depicting the humorous features of Southern backwoods life. Some of her negro stories are as good as have been done. Virginia Frazer Boyle has drawn phases of Southern life most deftly; deserving mention by the side of Frances Courtenay Baylor and Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake. Still later comers are Mrs. Bellamy and Mrs. M. E. Davis, each worthily adding to that ever widening volume of good literature that is one of the chief glories of the newer South.

VI.

What is to be said of this work as a whole? Perhaps the question may best be answered by comparison. Let us see for a little what may be said of some of the chief tendencies of current English fiction. Then let us compare results with the general character of the books we have been considering. So shall we know whether to class Southern literature below or above the average standard.

1. It will scarcely be denied that a great mass of modern English fiction bears strong stamp of realism. It would be well enough if books were all realistic at heart; making themselves so true as to be something to us; but then to bear a stamp of realism is not so well. A great deal is written nowadays by men or women insane with the idea of stamping their work with a hollow and evil fad so plainly that one forgets everything else in it. It is like smearing little wooden houses over with glaring red paint. We may possibly find a good warm room somewhere within—we are sure to see the coloring. The worst of it is that the paint has such a foul smell. Men of genius like Thomas Hardy forsake the sweet clouds and paint pig-sties. This is no hyperbole. A favorable review of his latest and "one of his strongest pieces of work" speaks of "that wonderfully realistic and powerful picture of the pig-sticking"—after which Arabella Fawley "walked up and down in front of her cottage door in sight of the whole church-going congregation one Sunday morning, 'bonnetless, her dishevelled hair blowing in the wind, her neck-fastening apart, her sleeves rolled up above her

elbows, and her hands reeking with melted fat.'"* There are other scenes in this lauded book too coarse for copying. This is realism gone mad. It is interesting to watch esthetic Mr. Howells wriggle himself into praising it.† Himself a pure poet at heart, he must yet stick up to his colors, even when they fly from a dunghill—he who at another time is man enough to say that no high name can condone indecent writing. What he refused to realists, he allows to realism. It is such gross realism that disfigures many modern books. If, in this mechanical age, artists must forsake the palette for the camera, why will they not at least focus decent objects? Better still, let them back to their easels! The photographer lives, let the painter live with him. It is false to draw a line and curse everything that is not on our side of it. In art as in life, Descartes' maxim holds true, and middle ground is safest ground. The best fiction is neither telescopic romance nor the realism of the microscope. On the one hand—"If I can write a story which will make you believe, *while you are reading it*, that when my hero was strolling down Fifth Avenue to attend a meeting of the Young Men's Kindergarten Club, he met a green dragon forty-seven feet long, with eighteen legs and three tails, and that the green dragon wept bitterly, and inquired the way to a cheese-shop—why, that's realism."‡ On the other hand, and more seriously, the best realism is the sort that remains perfectly true to the underlying reality of a thing, and yet transfigures, idealizes it. Realistic romance, idealistic realism—within these two neighboring fields grows the wheat with fewest tares.

2. Another characteristic of many modern novels is didacticism. We can never pick up an alluring looking book and settle back for an hour of solid rest without a haunting fear that beneath Peter Pindar's mask hides the face and frown of Bradley Headstone. From Mrs. Ward to Conan Doyle, the best of them are like to wound us in the house of our friends. Pathetic

*Laurence Hutton on "Jude the Obscure," in *Harper's Monthly* for Dec. 1895.

†See *Harper's Weekly*, Dec. 7, 1895.

‡H. C. Bunner, "Cheating at Letters," *Century Magazine*, March, 1895.

is the plaint of Bunner,—pathetic, delightful, and wise,—in behalf of “the plain man, the dollar and a half, and the author.” The plain man, beginning a railroad journey, buys “Jotham Keen; A Novel.” Expecting to be amused, he finds himself in the thick of a theological discussion. “The only thing he knows positively about the book, as he lays it down in disappointment and looks for the newsboy with the weekly papers, is that he has paid one dollar and fifty cents for it, and that he has no use for it whatever.” The temporary success of a few such volumes, successful in spite of their hobby, has flooded the market with hundreds of cheap imitations. One of our greatest monthlies cheats us into sociology, getting merited rebuke for the droning pessimism of its “stories,” Mrs. Foote forsakes her irrigated prairies to snow us under with the im-morals of illicit love; the same didactic purpose half discovers itself in the latest work of Mr. Crawford himself, and if he indeed desert us, to whom shall we turn? Since a giant like Wordsworth could partly spoil his poetry by persistent preaching, these lesser folk may well take heed to their prose.

3. But there is the opposite evil of emptiness. Mr. Bunner says the only thing needed is just a story that amuses, wherein he flies to the other extreme. No better example of this merely amusing work can be given than his own; light, pleasing, but completely ephemeral; unless, indeed, we name that silly Trilby, which has captivated thousands simply because it is a story. Foolish, trivial, harmful story it is! Yet perhaps there has been no such popular book since Ben Hur. What a contrast, what a difference! Does any one believe that German-Americans, ten years from now, will call for an edition of Trilby in their mother tongue? That is what has happened to the other book. Both popular, but one of them popular for a day; both stories, but one of them more than a story. If the plain man had spent his dollar and a half for Trilby, he would have been satisfied, because amused; if he had spent it for Ben Hur, he would have been gratified, because uplifted. And that through no slightest didacticism: didacticism declares, where a reader ought to be made to feel. The difference between the two books is that one

has a heart, and the other has not. The truth is ever the heart of a book. Give to it truth, purpose, earnestness; give it motive in itself, not on its surface, and the world will read it for years. It will *be* something to the world. Let no man trifle with this holy art, either to tell an idle tale, or to advertise his head. Let the men who have head and hand have also heart; let them feel the loftiness of their work, and its depth—then, not until then, will they be artists. "The arts can never be right in themselves, unless their motive is right."* Test all fiction that has stood, and see whether beneath the story there is not a soul.

4. But, again, the writer must see to it that he gives not the mere husks of his selfish vanity. A fourth flaw in our latest fiction is personal egotism. It shows through. Mr. Bunner makes a euphemism out of it, *Megacephalosis in Literates*. It is this that lies at the bottom of much didacticism. Because a man has written good detective stories, he must needs teach us creeds. As *The Independent* says,† "Let him hustle back to his story-writing!" But it goes beyond this; it amounts to the vulgarity of self-advertisement. The bald head of Mr. W. L. Douglas is a "household word throughout the world." The maker of Buttermilk Soap gives a full-length portrait of himself to an admiring public, with the modest words: "A man may do that which creates a desire in the minds of everybody as to what he looks like." But then we don't think any the more of him for his multifold photographs! And his work is no whit better. It is well enough for soap makers to write their names in public places, but why need authors obtrude themselves beyond their work? Must they fall back on the claptrap of the bill-poster? Cannot their thoughts speak for them? There is a vast deal of "Jones-he-pays-the-freight" in current literature. *The Ladies' Home Journal* dotes on it. Even Mr. Howells, in "My Literary Passions," makes a mighty big I of himself. Not theologies alone, but autobiographies also, hide between the lids of the modern book.

*Ruskin, in "The Mystery of Life and its Arts."

†On "The Stark-Munro Letters," Nov. 14, 1895.

If we are right; if these four faults really mar much that is written nowadays, do they mar Southern fiction with the rest? It is remarkable that the somewhat full review given in this paper does not disclose more than one or two such books, and only one such author. Self is lost in theme. The theme does not obtrude itself, but permeates and underlies. As for the style of treatment, it is, if the expression be allowed, an "idealistic realism." Beyond all, there is worthiness of purpose, deepness of feeling, conviction of calling. Still greater development of this spiritual motive is the one thing chiefly needful. The spirit is life. If all may not have the "divine afflatus," it is yet possible and proper to regard whatever power there is as a heavenly endowment, "a greater trust than ships and armies," and to use it as a lure. Draw men upwards! Fiction has its holy use, as well as its base abuse. Who has not been bettered by its best? Though it paint life "even as a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away," it may still show the thoughtless that "in the cloud of the human soul there is a fire stronger than the lightning, and a grace more precious than the rain." For him who wills a holy helpfulness, there is always found a way.

O risen South, fair with the promise of the morning, teach thy children all the upward look, the upward lifting! Teach them there is that which is stronger than strength, sweeter than new-found love, more dear than living. There is a wisdom that comes from above. It lifts the fallen towards the sunshine. It makes for righteousness, wooing and winning souls for some brighter ideal. *He that is wise winneth souls.*

"And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; as the stars for ever and ever."

ARTICLE V.

REGENERATION UNDER THE OLD COVENANT.

BY REV. GEORGE W. MCSHERRY, A. M.

The term regeneration means being born from above. It is a radical work of renovation within the heart by the Spirit of God. It is the creation of a new heart, the cleansing and renewal of the corrupt nature, the working of saving faith in the naturally perverted and faithless soul. It is the production of "the life of God" within the soul. It is therefore the power that produces conversion, and our theology rightly shows its relation to conversion in the orderly topical statement, "Regeneration and Conversion."

The question arises whether men were regenerated under the Old Testament *regime*, and whether God meant that they should be born again in the use of the means of grace provided in the old economy? Said a writer recently in regard to the baptism of John the Baptist: "Just what John's baptism signified and comprehended we regard by no means an easy question. It obviously involves yet a larger question, namely, the spiritual state of men who followed John and Christ prior to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. Were the disciples of Jesus regenerate men before they received the Holy Ghost, 'the Lord and Giver of life'?"

It is plain to the Bible student that regeneration holds a place in the history of the Chosen People, that it had a real existence in the lives of numerous Old Testament saints, not in the sense of a full evangelical knowledge, but in a restricted, yet more than mere germinal sense, and that God demanded this renovation by explicit statements, admonitions and proclamations in the prophets, and in other divine writings.

It would be a matter of interest and inquiry how able divines even can be swung into so extreme a position as to disallow efficient working of God's grace before the pentecostal down-

pour. Such an idea would certainly be an unseemly reflection upon the law and the prophets, circumcision and the Temple. It would be much more consistent with theological inquiry to ask whether the Gentiles could become regenerated before the pentecostal season, than to insinuate against the fact of Hebrew piety and inner life. Such a view of regeneration must be largely due to an unnecessary limitation of the Holy Spirit and a lack of discrimination between the ordinary and extraordinary in the economy and history of salvation.

Is it not likely that some of our Bible interpreters overlook the fact that the outpouring of the Holy Ghost at the pentecostal season was an extraordinary event; that this special miraculous gift was intended chiefly to qualify the disciples for preaching or teaching the saving word to all people, rather than to date the regeneration of men in the ordinary and true sense of that word? It must be an error to date the time when God meant to *renew* the hearts of men. What did the Saviour mean when before his ascension he breathed upon his apostles and said that they should receive the Holy Ghost? That the apostles then had saving faith, which can only be had by being born from above, is not to be doubted, and that his breathing upon them was not a vain act is evident. Imagine the divine Lord asking unregenerate men to receive the Holy Ghost!

When the great apostle to the Gentiles met some of John's disciples at Ephesus, he asked them whether they had received the Holy Ghost? They replied that they had not "heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Meyer and others hold that this is not to be understood that they had not known the existence of the Holy Ghost, for they could not have been under the instruction of the Old Testament, nor been baptized by John, without hearing of the existence of the Holy Ghost. The presupposition is that being baptized in the name of Christ they could not but have received the Holy Spirit.* Dr. Ormiston in an appended note to Meyer's comment says: "The words * * * must mean that they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Messiah, and were baptized into that faith, but they had not heard

*Vide Meyer on Acts.

anything about the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and the marvels that followed. That the question and answer both had reference to the special rather than ordinary gifts of the Spirit." Reference is made to this to show that before the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Ghost we have reason to believe that there was an *ordinary* working of the Holy Spirit, and that to speak of the new birth or regeneration as only accomplished at or after the pentecostal baptism is attaching undue significance to that great event, and is without warrant. We are to note that having been baptized, and having received the laying on of hands from Paul, "they spake with tongues, and prophesied," which makes obvious the extraordinary element in the case. We have no miraculous gifts now, but we have still the Spirit's regeneration and sanctifying power.

Again, there may be misapprehension and lack of discrimination on this point because of elevating the mind above the horizon of the old dispensation and fixing its eye upon the sacrament of baptism by which in the new dispensation the Holy Spirit works or completes regeneration. In this way the means of grace in the old dispensation are not amply regarded, nor is the freedom of the Holy Spirit recognized. The ancient Israel had the word and the Holy Spirit, and these wrought on men's hearts so as to bring them into communion with God, and there can be no communion with him without regeneration. Though the *fides explicita* be not reached, the essential matter abounds, viz., *trust in God*, like Abraham's, that moves all the personality, subduing the will, enlisting the confidence, setting conscience at ease, in short, all the essential characteristics of the regenerated heart and life as we now understand the work of grace. We must not forget also the imputation of righteousness as a concomitant of the faith of the old covenant.

In treating of regeneration we get into the sphere of the Spirit. It is the action of the divine Spirit upon the human spirit. The spirit of man manifests itself in intellect, sensibility and the will. Regeneration has to do with the mind and thoughts, the conscience and self-determination. The so-called

science of Gall and Combe rightly tells us of other original semi-intellectual or moral sentiments, notably veneration. Regeneration has to do also with the propensities and appetites indirectly. Man is more or less by nature subject to the lower range of feelings or sensibilities, the intellect serving to gain worldly or selfish ends, rather than serving an enlightened conscience. Consciousness tells us that there is discord in this wonderful unity of sublime powers; the moral intelligence served by these faculties not only has perceived and felt disorder within itself, but the personality is incapable of willing or doing by its own power what is in accord with the all-perfect Maker of the universe. Man is self-centred, or eccentric, instead of being spiritually heliocentric; he is a meteor in the spiritual universe.

Now I want to say that when God revealed his purpose to redeem and save man, and established a way of communication with himself, disclosing sin and alienation, proclaiming pardon, calling for faith in the Redeemer to come, and providing the rule of life, amplified and diversified in prophecy and psalm and proverb and miracle and sacred records,—when God by grace did all this, supplemented by the ceremonial law, he meant to enlighten the intellect, to correct the thoughts, to re-enforce and re-enthroned conscience, to reveal and correct a perverted veneration, and to give holy decision to the will. Here is spiritual reconstruction begun, and this, begun by lifting up all the best powers with the ascendancy of the will, in substantial harmony with our Maker, is regeneration, the starting point, observe, of sanctification. Regeneration is a babe; sanctification is the growing youth or ripe manhood. Sanctification is the principle of regeneration carried forward. Man begins to order his life in opposition to his depraved nature, and the power to co-ordinate imperfectly even all his immortal endowments came not by his own power or will but by the power and grace of God. What! A whole dispensation of thousands of years and no regenerate men, and yet the new dispensation never paralleled a man that “walked with God” and “was not,” and another carried aloft in fiery chariot, both removed from earth by a wonderful transla-

tion! What essential difference could there have been between the reconstructed manhood of David and that of Paul?

In the next place we are not to forget that the Holy Ghost is co-equal and co-eternal with the Father and the Son. Because his personality was not revealed very clearly has nothing to do with his active existence and gracious working within the sphere of grace among the Hebrews. Indeed, when God created the earth he, the Spirit, was active, for we are told in Genesis, that he brooded over chaos and brought it into order. "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." The regenerating and enlightening Spirit moved on the chaos of the heart and mind of God's servants of old and produced life and inspired knowledge and wisdom. Who inspired Moses and others to write the Old Testament Scriptures? Hear Peter's declaration: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter 1 : 21). What did David mean when he prayed, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me?" What did Isaiah mean when he spoke of the Jews as vexing the Holy Spirit? (Isa. 63 : 10). The Holy Spirit was of course confined in his action mostly to the Chosen People, and if he was thus known and not inactive in the way of inspiring and creating, why would he not as representative of the Godhead be active in influencing men's hearts and lives by the means employed by prophet and word, law and miracle? "Holy men of old," mark, *holy men of old*, were specially moved by the Holy Spirit; they were devout and heaven-born, regenerated, who desired "a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." (Heb. 11 : 16).

Again, what does the prophet mean when he (Ezekiel) says, "And I will put my Spirit within you?" Is it clear that he is speaking only of New Testament saints, and not at all of the returned captives? Idolatry was forever renounced by the Jews after the return from Babylon. What is meant by the Old Testament utterance, "circumcision of the heart?" What does David mean when he supplicates the Throne, "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me?" Was the

nature of Abraham's faith different from that of Paul's? How could Paul in his Epistle to the Romans call Abraham the father of them that believe? "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of them that believe, though they be not circumcised." Abraham was justified by faith, and faith is the gift of God, and the work of the Holy Spirit. He had saving faith. Saving faith must be the offspring of the regenerative grace of God and therefore the essential spiritual life and principle of regeneration.

The promises made in different places in holy writ concerning richer spiritual experience, deeper inner life, and the sweet influences of the Comforter, are not meant to imply that there were no such blessings precedent. The literal knowledge of Christ is not to be compared with the spiritual knowledge of God of old time. The full-orbed faith of the new covenant with all its explicit knowledge can not be said to be more pleasing to God or more spiritual than the faith of the grand old worthies extolled in the eleventh of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The faith that works by love is more than knowledge, by which it is meant to accentuate the fact that hearts can be made new without stores of sacred erudition.

The necessary means for making men righteous were given and urged on men under the old covenant. God was revealed as a God of mercy and pardon, as the good Shepherd, kind and loving. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah sets forth the One who was to come as the sin-bearer, and men were to have a penitent and pious spirit; to worship God, and on special occasions to approach the throne of grace by the bloody sacrifices, the type of the bleeding Lamb of God. People *now* have faith in a sort of rudimentary sense; their knowledge of Christ and the plan of salvation is not yet as full as it can and may become. And yet we believe them to be regenerate, because of the evidence of the faith manifested. Children are called regenerate who are received into the covenant by the sacrament of baptism, and why should not the many pious saints of old have been changed

in nature by the Spirit through the word and other means then established? How absurd to think otherwise!

God meant that his chosen people should be like Nathaniel and Simeon and a host of others who looked for the promised Redeemer. When our Lord called Nathaniel to be his disciple, we see a pious Israelite, a man "without guile," as the Lord declared, who was ready without repentance from dead works or guilty sinfulness to be received into the kingdom of wider spiritual horizon. Many in Christ's time were "waiting for the consolation of Israel," who were children of God under the old covenant and ready for adoption under the new.

The world existed many ages and men lived not knowing the scientific explanation of things, did not know the chemistry of the kitchen, nor the true physiology of the body, and countless other things generally known, but they lived nevertheless, lived with little knowledge and few inventions, and still they had their day of prosperity and happiness; so men under the old dispensation lived and walked by faith, and wrought in love, though they saw not the express image of God the Father in the face of Jesus Christ, and knew not the personality of the Holy Spirit, saw as in a glass darkly, only less plainly than we.

Godet, writing on the subject of "The Four Chief Apostles," contrasts the religious life and experience of James the Just with the religious life and experience of Paul. In this we have an illustration of Old Testament regeneration. We are to realize that Old Testament believers were in a sense what pious children are to day in the Christian Church—regenerate.

Paul was of the school of Pharisees who perverted the law and made it a round of commandments in the keeping of which, as in the performance of a task, they sincerely or hypocritically regarded themselves as earning or meriting the reward of salvation. Then his name was Saul. Even as a Hebrew of the Hebrews he by his own strength performed the precepts of the law and traditions thus adding barrier to barrier in opposition to grace. Conversion here was necessary, for we are saved by grace and not by the deeds of the law. Here was degeneration rather than regeneration. Now when the law was set on fire by

the fuse of the Spirit in the heart of Saul, he said it slew him; he had no spiritual life, the law was a minister of death to him. "But," says Godet, "there was also, among the Jews themselves, a very different way of regarding the law, by virtue of which the gospel grace was not the *contrast*, but the *fulfilment* of the legal covenant. This was the conception of the psalmists when they cried, 'The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart. * * More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honey-comb.' (Ps. 19 : 8, 10). * * 'The law of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul,' (Ps. 19 : 7) etc., etc. This state of mind, characteristic of the truly humble Israelite, has nothing in common with that of the Pharisee. He makes no pretence of accomplishing the law in his own strength in order to claim the merit of its accomplishment. Recognizing in the law itself a gift of Jehovah's grace, he does not presume to receive it but in his fellowship and by his aid. If there be a salvation which he yet awaits, he expects it in the shape of a deeper and more perfect law and a still more potent grace."

Here Godet is speaking of the faith of St. James which is in correspondence with the faith of the gospel believer. In him the grace of God wrought to the subduing of the soul, and of such Dr. Godet exclaims: "See how these humble believers, with their feet already in the way of salvation, still sighed and panted for the salvation of God!" "To such as these the law was not the antithesis of grace; it was a grace not yet made perfect." To such as James the Lord Jesus had only to be proven as the Saviour of men when he would be received as the law of God personified. Such had all the elements of spiritual life found in them who are born from above.

"The truth is, that the Christian Church is the continuation of the Church that preceded it, only with enlarged life, privileges and powers. The Israelites had the Gospel preached to them as really as it has been preached to us (Heb. 4 : 2). Patriarchism was the embryo, and Judaism the chrysalis and cradle of Christianity. They each belong to the one divine economy of human redemption. The latter is simply a graft on the root and

stock of the former (Rom. 11 : 18). Everything under the Mosaic code had reference to what was to be under Christ, and, in a way accommodated to the times, embodied all the elements of genuine Christianity.*

Once more, we are to note the language of Jesus to Nicodemus. We have here an irrefutable position in support of the proposition that regeneration was not only disclosed and taught in the Old Testament, but expected as an experience in the life. Why did Christ chide this "master in Israel?" Because of his ignorance on this doctrine of regeneration. His manner of thinking, feeling, and acting, in relation to God were in need of fundamental revolution. Nicodemus spoke as though Jews were by nationality spiritually right, or as though the formalities of the ancient religion brought the righteousness of God. But the inner life had to be rectified by the divine Spirit, and the true Master of Israel proceeded to deliver a lecture to him on the Holy Spirit and his office. The Holy Spirit wrought the transformation of the heart before "the veil of the temple was rent in twain." The Saviour substantially declared: "Marvel not, Nicodemus; you ought to have felt the breath of the Spirit, for he comes and goes invisibly as the wind, but leaves his impress on the heart." (St. John 3 : 1-13).

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, standard commentators, say on this interview: "The question clearly implies that *the doctrine of regeneration is so far disclosed in the Old Testament that Nicodemus was culpable in being ignorant of it*. Nor is it merely as something that should be experienced *under the Gospel* that the Old Testament holds forth, as many distinguished critics allege, denying that there was any such thing as regeneration before Christ. For our Lord's proposition is universal, that no fallen man is or can be spiritual without a regenerating operation of the Holy Ghost, and the necessity of a *spiritual obedience*, under whatever name, in opposition to mere mechanical services, is proclaimed throughout all the Old Testament."

The distinguished Meyer quoted above remarks: "Still, as

*From Dr. J. A. Seiss on "The Liturgical Question," in July number 1896 of the *QUARTERLY*.

one acquainted with the Scriptures, he (Nicodemus) *might* and *ought* to have recognized the possibility regarding the nature of the new birth; for the power of the divine Spirit, the need of renewal in heart and mind, and the fact that this renewal is a divine work, are often mentioned in the Old Testament."

We therefore regard it as unreasonable and untenable to maintain that regeneration did not occur under the old covenant and was not divinely expected, or provided for. To maintain such a view would be a reflection on the use of the Old Testament in pulpit and school and home. It would give a superfineness and astuteness to the term regeneration, or lead to a particularism, undesirable and unscriptural. We cannot but believe that when God gave his servants of old time the broken and the contrite spirit, it was not different from the same given by the Holy Spirit later on, and that trust and obedience that pleased God, must have pleased, and been wrought by, the Third Person of the Trinity.

Finally it might be remarked that were the Old Testament alone to fall into the hands of intelligent men who knew not the Gospel or New Testament, what verdict would they render on this point, but the conclusion arrived at in this inquiry? They would declare that man is a sinful and depraved creature; that he has come short of the glory of God and is in absolute need of a deep moral and spiritual change. They would declare it set forth clearly that God demands a new nature, calls and pleads for repentance and faith, and provides an accessible way of approach to him, and wants union and communion with himself. Would that not be the verdict? It certainly would. Now ask this circle of thoughtful and intelligent men whether they can find any men who gave evidence of return to God under the old covenant; whether men exhibited sorrow for sin, such sorrow as constrained them to renounce their iniquity and turn into the way of filial obedience; whether also God was reconciled and expressed his pleasure in such? They would certainly decide that an innumerable host must have been washed and cleansed, made new in heart, and have entered upon the antitype of the earthly land of promise, and that God would not cry,

"Wash you and make you clean," "Repent," and "Come, now, and let us reason together:" "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool;"—God would not cry thus and withhold the power which produces the conversion or regeneration.

ARTICLE VI.

EPISTLE FOR PALM SUNDAY. PHILIPPIANS 2: 5-11.

BY REV. WILLIAM HULL.

5. Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,
6. Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:
7. But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:
8. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross:
9. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name;
10. That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth:
11. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Palm Sunday is the church festival which emphasizes the kingship of our Lord Jesus Christ. He said to Pilate *that he was a king*, and that to this end he came into the world. Yet at the same time he said his kingdom was not of this world—that is, from a worldly point of view. Yet he is to have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. All kings are to bow down before him and all nations are to serve him.

The Divine Being here portrayed in this portion of Scripture which we are considering, has other portraitures drawn by in-

NOTE.—An exegesis read at the meeting of the Northern Conference of the New York and New Jersey Synod at Rhinebeck, N. Y. Conference passed a resolution requesting its publication in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

spired penmen in other parts of the sacred Scriptures. This is the picture Isaiah presents: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. (Isaiah 9 : 6).

St. John draws this picture: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men." (John 1 : 1, 2, 3).

St. Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, draws the outline of this unique character in these words: "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds: who being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high." (Heb. 1 : 1-3).

1. But let us notice successively the declarations made by St. Paul in this epistle to the Philippians. He says: "Who being in the form of God."

The Greek word *μορφη* means form, figure. It relates to external appearance. Our Lord said (John 1 : 18): "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him." He who is in the form of a living man we call a man—he is a man—she who is in the form of a living woman we call a woman—she is a woman. The animal in the form of a lion must be a lion and not some other beast. One in the form of God cannot be less than God. Of God's external appearance we know nothing—we can have but very crude conceptions of his appearance. The declaration therefore of St. Paul that our Lord was in the form of God previous to his advent on earth is equivalent to asserting his divinity.

2. This view is confirmed by the next declaration : "Thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

The New Version reads : "Accounted it not a prize to be on equality with God." In my notes in my Greek Testament, on the word "robbery" I find this rendering by my theological teacher, the late Rev. Dr. George B. Miller, "a thing to be seized." In the Lutheran Commentary Drs. Horn and Voight say : "Counted it not a prize to be snatched at, to be equal with God."

To have pretended to be equal with God when he was not equal would have been a trespass, an attempt at robbery, an encroachment upon the divine prerogatives. It would have made our Lord a pretender. But being in the form of God and being God, it was no encroachment, no attempt at robbery and no pretence to claim equality with God. He was with the Father and the equal of the Father from all eternity. He said to the Jews (John 10 : 30) : "I and my Father are one." They understood that as a declaration of an equality with God, for they took up stones to stone him for blasphemy, saying : "For a good work we stone thee not ; but for blasphemy ; and that thou being a man makest thyself God."

In each of the two declarations, therefore, of the sixth verse, the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is most clearly taught.

This then was the previous condition of the world's Redeemer before he came to earth.

The plan of salvation involved his becoming incarnate. He took upon himself our nature—he became bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, he was to suffer for sin in the flesh. The Son of God was also to become the Son of Man. How this was accomplished is a great mystery and so St. Paul the inspired apostle regarded it. He says in his first letter to Timothy (1 Tim. 3 : 16), "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness : God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

3. The first declaration of the seventh verse is : "He made himself of no reputation."

His mother was of humble parentage. He was reared in poverty in the obscure village of Nazareth. No one suspected that the God of the universe was dwelling in the child Jesus. The glory of his divine nature was not manifest—it was hidden—veiled by the flesh—he had apparently emptied himself of his glory. On the mount of transfiguration it temporarily burst forth and then we read (Matt. 17 : 2), "And his face did shine as the sun and his raiment was white as the light." For thirty years the Divine Redeemer lived in obscurity in Nazareth, following the occupation of a mechanic. Surely "He made himself of no reputation."

4. The next declaration of the apostle is: "And took upon himself the form of a servant."

He who was in the form of God and who could only be recognized as God in that form which he had borne from eternity, now suffered a transition in the new form he had assumed and he appeared in the form of a servant. He looked like a servant. He followed a menial occupation: he was surrounded by the environments of poverty. He said (Matt. 20 : 28), "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life as a ransom for many." After supper he girded himself and washed his disciples feet. It was an infinite condescension from the form of God to the form of a servant.

5. The next statement is: "And was made in the likeness of men."

He became a real man. The Gnostics taught in the early centuries of the Christian Church that he had not taken upon himself human nature—that it was an illusion of the senses—that he seemed like a man but was not a real man. He was not only found in the fashion or form of a man, but he had flesh and blood as we have. When he died it was not only an appearance of a dying man but a real death. After his resurrection Thomas was invited to thrust his hand into the spear-pierced side of the Redeemer and to put his fingers where the cruel nails had been and to believe. He was satisfied and exclaimed, "My Lord and my God."

6. The next declaration of the apostle is: "He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

His enemies could not humble him without his consent. He had power to wipe them out of existence by a word, but in permitting the humiliation he is said to have humbled himself. What a bitter humiliation he experienced the last week of his earthly life. To be arraigned before the Jewish court and charged falsely with blasphemy—to stand as a prisoner at the bar of a heathen tribunal—to be charged with treason against the government, to be scourged, spit upon, smitten with rods, crowned with thorns, to be mocked and derided as a fictitious king, to be pronounced guilty of blasphemy, and although held to be innocent on the charge of treason by his pagan judge, yet to be sentenced to its penalty—to be nailed to the cross and to die its painful and disgraceful death between two robbers, was humbling himself in an extreme degree.

But this humiliation was short-lived. He bowed his head to the great conqueror death and he was held by him in bondage only three days, when to the astonishment of his followers, he who had been dead was alive again. He arose by his own power which exceeded that of death. The strong man armed was overcome. At the same time hundreds of millions of the Redeemer's brethren were lying in the grave under the despotic power of death. He had power to lay down his life and take it again, but they had no such power as the kingly Redeemer had. In the time to come he will reappear to exercise his omnipotent resurrection-power for his brethren as he did for himself, and then the bondage of death will be broken and all these dead shall live.

The tide turned as he came out of the new tomb in the garden of Joseph of Arimathea. Then the humiliation of the God-man had ended and with it commenced the succession of his wonderful triumphs, culminating in the occupancy of the throne of the universe, with his Father, as the inheritor of all things.

He did not change his residence to the celestial world until

forty days after he came forth from the tomb in the garden as the conqueror of death. That triumph is the precursor of the general victory which all shall achieve when the trumpet of the archangel shall sound.

After a number of appearances to his followers, covering a period of forty days, he led them out as far as Bethany, and while his hands were extended in blessing them he arose from their midst and a cloud received him out of their sight. Thus he who first appeared on earth as a little child in Bethlehem, after thirty-three years went back again to the celestial country in this glorious manner, having conquered death and the grave—the greatest conqueror who ever trod the earth. He accomplished the redemption of the human race and made it possible for them to reach heaven at length and to become sharers with him in the glory he had achieved and to become kings and priests unto God to reign forever and ever. He said to his apostles, "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so I would have told you: I go to prepare a place for you that where I am there ye may be also."

"Princes to his imperial name
Bend their bright sceptres down;
Dominions, thrones and powers rejoice,
To see him wear the crown.

Archangels sound his lofty praise
Through ev'ry heavenly street;
And lay their richest honors down,
Submissive at his feet."

7. St. Paul says further in the Scripture we are considering: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name."

The being of our Lord Jesus Christ is unique in the universe. There are at least God, the God-man, archangels, angels and men. By its union with our Lord Jesus Christ, human nature has been exalted or lifted up above angel and archangel. It is a mystery to us, yet we are clearly taught that the Father has exalted the human nature represented in the Son far above principalities and powers and above every name, subordinate to himself, that is named.

How all names here on earth pale before the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is above all names even as the heavens are higher than the earth. Four hundred millions of the human family worship him and are called by his name. How strange it appears to the eye of an unbeliever that a peasant of Nazareth, who never attended human schools, who never held an office, who was not endorsed by the great or rich or the influential, should attain such a pre-eminence, such a fame and such a following. He had died as a malefactor upon the cross which was a symbol of shame, but to-day that cross has become the symbol of the world's redemption from the bondage of sin and Satan. It now crowns the highest architectural points in the world as a symbol of the highest glory and reverence. Christians sing,

"In the cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time;
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime."

8. In the closing part of this Scripture the apostle describes the final result of Christ's exaltation from the deep depths of his earthly humiliation. He says: "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

This is a marvelous consummation. The meek and lowly one of Nazareth, the God-man, becomes the illustrious sovereign of heaven, earth and hell and he receives tokens of subordination to his kingly and universal rule. The ovation of Palm Sunday on its limited scale expands to cover the realm of the universe. Human nature wedded to divinity becomes the Lamb's wife and sits as queen over this vast expanse of the creation.

In that coming day of the complete coronation no one will challenge his sovereignty and he shall reign forever and ever as the mighty monarch of the universe, with a most beneficent rule, to the infinite advantage and joy of all his subjects.

"Let every kindred, every tribe
On this terrestrial ball,
To him all majesty ascribe
And crown him Lord of all."

ARTICLE VII.

THE MEANING AND EFFICACY OF INFANT BAPTISM.

BY REV. SAMUEL SCHWARM, PH. D.

Our Saviour's commission, on which the sacrament of baptism is based, is, "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," etc. This makes it obligatory upon his Church to baptize infants as well as adults, for both classes are included in a nation. The Augsburg Confession, Art. IX., therefore, says: "Of Baptism they teach (namely our churches), that it is necessary to salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is offered, and that children are to be baptized, who by baptism, being offered to God, are received into God's favor.

They condemn the Anabaptists who allow not the baptism of children, and affirm that children are saved without baptism."

But if children are to be baptized, as is evidently taught by the Word and the Confession, of what meaning and efficacy is this sacrament to them?

In order to discuss this subject properly and beneficially it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the true nature of baptism as it is taught in the sacred Scriptures and the symbols of our Church. In John 3 : 5 it is written: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be *born of water* and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." In Mark 16 : 16, it is written: "He that believeth, and is *baptized*, shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be damned." In Acts 2 : 38, it is written: "Repent, and be *baptized* every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And in Titus 3 : 5, it is written: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by *the washing of regeneration*, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." And in Eph. 5 : 26, it is written: "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that

he might sanctify and cleanse it by the *washing of water* by the word." And again in Heb. 10 : 21, it is written: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and *our bodies washed with pure water.*" And again in 1 Pet. 3 : 21, 22, it is written of the "Ark, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water, the like figure whereunto *baptism doth now save us.*"

We see from these passages of the Scriptures, which are admitted by all except partisans to refer to baptism, that this ordinance of God is infinitely more than the mere application of the water to the subject, or of the subject to the water. The washing with water is most intimately connected with the washing of the Holy Ghost and the word, consequently, with the *new birth*. They speak of being "born of water and the Spirit," of being "washed by water by the word," of the "washing of regeneration (evidently baptism) and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Hence baptism is most intimately connected with the work of saving grace in man, and is called (Tit. 3 : 5) "the washing of regeneration." It is one of God's means of bestowing saving grace upon sinful men. Hence Luther says, in his Smaller Catechism, "Baptism is not simply water, but it is the water comprehended in God's command, and connected with God's word."

He also says in the Smalcald Articles: "Baptism is nothing else than the word in the water, commanded in the institution, or as Paul says, a washing by the word; or just as Augustine says, 'The word comes to the element and it becomes a sacrament.'" And in his Larger Catechism Luther says: "Therefore I exhort that these two, the water and the word, be by no means separated. For if the word be taken away, the water is the same as that with which the servant cooks, and may indeed be called a bath-keeper's baptism. But when the word is added, as God has ordained, it is a sacrament, and is called Christian baptism."

Baptism, according to the conception of Luther and the Lutheran Church, is not a mere water bath, nor yet a mere use of the words of the commission without water, but it is the use of

the two in connection, as our Lord and Saviour has commanded. The Lutheran Church knows nothing of a mere water baptism. In its conception there can be no baptism where the water and the word are not connected according to the great commission, "Go ye therefore," etc. But whenever and wherever these two elements are properly connected, according to Christ's command, there there is true baptism; and that baptism is a divine sacrament. And a sacrament, according to its conception, "is a holy ordinance instituted by God, through which, by means of external and visible elements, he bestows and seals his grace." (See Catechism).

Now this sacrament of baptism, through which God "bestows and seals his grace," is to be applied to infants as well as to believing adults.

First, Because of the commission, which includes infants as well as adults.

Second, Because of the need of the children of God's grace. The custom of infant baptism has, of course, for its background the doctrine of original sin. It implies that infants are, by nature, subject to the wrath of God as well as unsaved adults; and that the former need God's saving grace as much as the latter. The infant does not belong to the kingdom of God by natural birth, but to the kingdom of Satan. It is not, by its natural birth, an heir of the righteousness of the covenant of redemption, but an heir of the wrath and condemnation of violated law. Its relationship to God and his redemptive plan must be changed before it can be an heir of the "righteousness of faith."

This is evidently the teaching of the word of God as well as of the symbols of our Church. And it is the teaching of the latter simply because it was found to be the express teaching of the former. Job says, 25 : 4, "How can he be clean that is born of a woman." This certainly refers to uncleanness inhering in birth and not coming merely by actual transgression. The Psalmist says, 51 : 5 : "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me." Our blessed Saviour says : "That which is born of the flesh (sinful nature) is flesh (sinful)." And Paul says, Gal 3 : 22 : "But the Scripture hath

concluded all under sin." "There is none righteous, no, not one." And in Rom. 5 : 12, he says : "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so hath death passed upon all men, for all have sinned." That "all men" here includes infants is evident from the fact that they are also the subjects of death which is the fruit of sin. And again Paul says : "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

Therefore, according to the Scriptures, human nature, of which infants are also partakers, is estranged from God, is under the condemnation of the law, and cannot enter into the kingdom of God unless it is "born again of water and of the Spirit," or first changed in its nature and relation towards God.

Now let us see the testimony of our Church on this subject. "Also they teach (Augs. Conf., Art. II.) that, after Adam's fall, all men begotten after the common course of nature, are born in sin : that is, without the fear of God, without trust in him, and with fleshly appetites, and that this disease, or original fault, is truly sin, condemning and bringing eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost. They condemn the Pelagians, and others, who deny this original fault to be sin indeed ; and who, so as to lessen the glory of the merits and benefits of Christ, argue that a man may, by the strength of his own reason, be justified before God."

And in the Smalcald Articles we read : "This hereditary sin is so deep [and horrible] a corruption of nature, that no reason can understand it, but it must be [learned and] believed from the revelation of the Scriptures. Ps. 51 : 5 ; Rom. 5 : 12, etc."

This subject is also fully discussed in the Apology to the Confession and in the Formula of Concord. All these symbols of the Lutheran Church prove very clearly from the Scriptures that original sin adheres to infants and that it is "truly sin and condemns to eternal death all who are not born again of baptism and the Holy Spirit."

Third, Because it is the only sacrament that is peculiarly adapted to the infant and the only visible way by which God's saving grace can be brought, by the Church, to bear upon the

child. If infants, by the fact of their participation in human nature, are the heirs of eternal death, how are they to be reached by God's saving grace and made heirs of "the righteousness of faith," viz., eternal life? Is there any way by which they can be reached, according to God's plan of salvation, through his Church? Has the Gospel of Christ Jesus, as it has been committed unto his Church, any way by which it can reach the child with the offer and bestowal of grace, or must it be admitted, as it is admitted by some of the opponents of infant baptism, "that by the Gospel no infant can be saved;" and that "the Gospel has nothing to do with infants?"* If such is the case, then the New Testament is less comprehensive than the Old. If such be the case, then it cannot be truly said, as Paul says, "Where sin abounded there did grace much more abound;" for sin has reached the child with its condemnation, but grace does not abound for its regeneration and salvation, in so far at least as the Gospel committed unto the Church is concerned. The old covenant, as administered under the patriarchal and Jewish Church, had a scheme of salvation for the child. It had a special rite or sacrament by which the child at eight days of age was brought into covenant relations with God and made an heir of the "righteousness of faith." But the new covenant, as administered by the Church of Christ, has no scheme by which it can reach the child and make it an heir of the covenant of grace, unless baptism be that scheme, for the child manifestly cannot be reached by the oral preaching of the word. But baptism is, according to God's word and the teaching of our Church, God's ordinary means of grace to the child through his Church. Martensen says: "What circumcision was for the children of Israel, baptism is, though in a far higher sense, for Christians, a pledge that the God of the community is the God of the individual, and that the Redeemer of the Church will be the Redeemer of each member. According to the word of God, In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision

* See Ewing & Carson as quoted by Seiss in his "Baptist System Examined."

of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherefore also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead. (Col. 2 : 11, 12)."*

Gerhard says: "There is no other ordinary means of regeneration than the word and the sacrament of baptism. By the word infants cannot be influenced, but only adults, who have come to years of discretion. It remains, therefore, that they are regenerated, cleansed from the contagion of original sin, and made partakers of eternal life, through baptism."†

Our Saviour says: "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Now how can infants be brought to Jesus but through baptism? Certainly not through the preached word. And then if they are subjects fitted to be made members and heirs of the kingdom of heaven, as is implied by, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," and "Except ye be converted and become as a little child, ye cannot," etc., certainly they ought not to be denied the sign and the seal of the kingdom, but it ought to be applied unto them.

We have considered the true meaning of baptism and why it should be applied to the child. Now let us notice more particularly what baptism is to the child, and what it effects in the child, according to God's word and the Confession of our Church.

First. In baptism God offers his saving grace to the child. This is implied in the fact that it is a means of grace, as the word of God evidently teaches. "Means of grace are a divinely appointed channel through which God makes known, offers, and communicates his grace."‡ In infant baptism, Christ through his Church, approaches the child with the offer and bestowal of grace. The Confession says: "And by baptism the grace of God is offered." "Baptism is an act which goes out from Christ, a divine motion toward the sinner."§ "Baptism as a divine ceremony, is the act by which Christ, our invisible High Priest and King, establishes his Church within the individual. The old covenant was established by an act of election, for the Lord separated Abraham to the true worship, made his covenant

*See his Dogmatics.

‡See Catechism.

†See Schmid's Dogmatics, 549.

§Seiss.

with him and with his seed, and instituted circumcision as the sign of the covenant. In like manner the new covenant was established by an act of election, for the new Adam set his disciples apart from the race of mankind, 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you.' " (Martensen). "The primary design of baptism," says Hollazius, "is the *offering*, application, conferring and sealing of evangelical grace." "To infants," says Gerhard, "baptism is *primarily* the ordinary means of regeneration and purification from sin." That is, baptism is the means by which Christ, through his Church, offers the grace of salvation to the child, saying: "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." "The object of baptism," says Martensen again, "is to spread the spirit of hope in God's election of grace throughout life, to be a sign from heaven upon which believers may base the certainty of their election; a certainty which cannot be retained by merely inward convictions in the midst of life's changes, but which must be associated with a visible sign, like the rainbow, to which they can look back in the midst of the storms of life in every time of external or inward need; a bow of hope in the clouds appearing as the rainbow did in the days of Noah."

Second. By baptism the child is placed into a right relation with God, namely, into a covenant relationship with him. Baptism introduces the child into the kingdom of God and makes it an heir of redeeming grace. Or, as the Confession says: "Children are to be baptized, who by baptism, *being offered to God*, are received into his favor." "Infant baptism is the divinely appointed token and sacrament of infant discipleship; the solemn rite in which the remedial kingdom comes to the child, and the child comes into visible relationship with the kingdom of God. It is the great Christening ordinance, without which no child can be regarded as truly belonging to the visible kingdom of God." And it is the only visible rite by which the child can be made a member of Christ's visible kingdom.

As the infant by the sacrament of circumcision, under the Old Testament dispensation, was brought into covenant relations

with God and made an heir of all the blessings of the covenant, so under the New Testament dispensation the infant is brought into covenant relations with God and made a member of his kingdom and an heir of its blessings by the sacrament of baptism. Of course, the child in riper years can by unbelief and disobedience forfeit the blessings of the covenant, just as the child who had been circumcised could by his unbelief become a child of the wicked one. But this did not disprove the validity and value of circumcision: "For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God of none effect? God forbid!" So with the sacrament of baptism by which the child is brought into covenant relations with God and made an heir of the redeeming grace of Christ. It may be rendered wholly ineffectual by falling into unbelief. But that does not disprove its validity and precious value to all those who abide faithfully in their covenant relations. Baptism is spoken of by Martensen "as the sacrament of instituting the true relation to God."

Infant baptism may be properly described as the sacrament of instituting right relations with God, of bringing the child into covenant relations with him and making it a member of his kingdom according to his own appointed ordinance. But it may be said, The children of believing parents are already, by virtue of their birth, in the relation of believers with him and presumptively members of his kingdom and heirs of the promise, for, "The promise is to you and to your children." But we have no visible pledge of their heirship until the sign and the seal of the covenant of grace is administered to them by Christ's Church. They may, by virtue of their birth of Christian parents, have a right to the sign and seal of the "righteousness of faith," but they have no visible or positive pledge of the benefits of the covenant prior to their baptism. We have a parallel case in regard to the relation of the children of the circumcised Israelite with the covenant with God. His children were presumptively Israelites and heirs of the covenant in which their father lived, and had a right to the sign and seal of that covenant, but until that sign and seal was administered unto them, they were not in reality Israelites, for God said, "And the uncircumcised

man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." (Gen. 17 : 14). And the Lord met Moses in the way and sought to kill him because he had neglected to circumcise his children. (Ex. 4 : 24). Thus it is very apparent that these children of circumcised Israelites did not by virtue of their birth stand in the same relation with God and the covenant before their circumcision as they did afterwards. And certainly the children of Christian parents have not already by birth every thing that baptism really signifies. If they had, then baptism would signify nothing at all to them.

Regenerate parents do not beget children after their regenerate nature, but after their carnal or fleshly, and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and needs to be born again of water and the Spirit. It needs to be placed into right relation with God. Not that God will eternally damn the child that, on account of no fault of its own, has not received the sign and seal of the covenant, but because baptism is God's ordinary means of grace to the child, and no parent has the right to neglect God's ordinary way of salvation to his child and expect him to save it in an extraordinary way. God undoubtedly is able to save the child in an extraordinary way, but no parent ought to try to force him to do so by the neglect of his ordinary means. Parents should make a prayerful use of the means of grace, for the salvation of their children, which God has provided.

Third. Baptism secures for the child the gracious favor of God. In baptism the child is not simply offered to God and brought into covenant relations with him, but it is actually received into his favor. The Confession says: "Who by baptism, being offered to God, *are received into his favor.*" This is certainly substantiated by the words of our Saviour, "Suffer the little children," etc.; and, "Except ye be converted and become as a little child," etc. These passages certainly imply that the little children who are brought to him are most graciously received into his favor. And he also said, "If any man offend one of these little ones that believe on me it were better that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck and he drowned in the midst of the sea."

But how can any "little one" be said to believe in Jesus except as it is brought into a believing relation with him by baptism? And as God most graciously received the little ones who were brought unto him by the sacrament of circumcision, as we are assured he did in the case of Samuel, Jeremiah, John the Baptist, etc., so he also does those who are brought to him by the sacrament of baptism.

Luther in his Larger Catechism gives us an answer for those who doubt whether children also believe and whether it be right to baptize them. "That baptism of infants is pleasing to Christ is sufficiently proved from his own work, namely, that God sanctifies many of them who have been baptized, and has given them the Holy Spirit; and that there are yet many even to-day in whose life and doctrine we perceive they have the Holy Ghost; as it is also given to us by the grace of God that we can expound the Scriptures and come to a knowledge of Christ, which is impossible without the Holy Spirit. But if God did not accept the baptism of infants, he would not give the Holy Spirit, nor any part thereof to any of them; therefore during this long time unto this day, no man on earth could have been a Christian. But since God confirms baptism by the gift of the Holy Ghost, as is plainly perceptible in some of the church fathers, as St. Bernard, Gerson, John Huss, and others, who were baptized in infancy, and since the Holy Christian Church cannot perish until the end of the world, they must acknowledge that such infant baptism is pleasing to God. For he can never be opposed to himself, or support falsehood and wickedness, or for its promotion impart his grace and Spirit."

Luther himself was a most conspicuous proof that baptized infants are accepted into God's favor and are not denied his Spirit. He was baptized on the day following his birth, and was an advocate of infant baptism during all his public ministry, and was a powerful confessor that Christ had come in the flesh, and was manifestly in the possession of the Holy Spirit. But Paul says, "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." So with the great host of saints from the Reformation

down until now, Melancthon, Arndt, Spener, Knox, Wesley, Swartz, Chalmers, etc. If infant baptism were not acceptable to Christ he would certainly not have bestowed upon these men who were baptized in infancy, and who practiced infant baptism, such an extraordinary measure of his grace and Spirit. If infant baptism were not pleasing to God, and baptized infants received into his favor, he certainly would not have maintained his Church in the world for centuries solely through those who were made his disciples in infancy, either by circumcision or baptism. So the blessings which have attended those who were baptized in infancy, and the churches that have practiced infant baptism through their whole history, prove most conclusively that baptized infants are received into God's favor and are most graciously blessed by him.

It appears to me that this single argument ought to settle forever, not merely the validity of infant baptism, but also that it is pleasing in the sight of God and most heartily approved by him. If infant baptism were the sin which some of its opponents have claimed, would God in any way have added his blessing in connection with it? We are told in the word that God cannot look upon sin with any degree of allowance. And yet infant baptism has been considered by nearly the whole Church, since the days of Christ, a means of grace, and he has manifestly blessed his Church in the practice of it. Would he have done this if it were an abominable sin? Most assuredly not. His blessing in that case, in the days of the Reformation, would have been bestowed upon the Anabaptists instead of upon the Lutherans. The history of Christ's Church proves that infant baptism is not displeasing unto God, but that he has undoubtedly received baptized infants into his favor and blessed many of them by his renewing grace.

These three things, therefore, may be said to be the meaning and efficacy of infant baptism. It is an offer of grace on the part of Christ, through his Church, to the child. It is the placing of the child into proper relation with God and his kingdom. It is the reception of the child into favor by God. These things,

of course, assures the salvation of the child, of whose salvation we have no positive and visible pledge outside of baptism.

Fourth. Baptism is not merely a pledge to the child of the grace of the covenant of salvation at some future time, but it is the actual bestowal of that grace. A sacrament, according to the Lutheran conception, bestows grace, and is not merely a sign or pledge of it, for such future time, possibly at death or at confirmation. But we must bear in mind here what baptism really is, that it "is not simply water, but it is the water comprehended in God's command, and connected with God's word." This makes it a sacrament, a means of grace, and "God's Holy Spirit is always present in the means of grace, and works saving faith in those who do not resist him."* Hence Luther says in his Shorter Catechism: "Baptism works the forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation on all who believe, as the word and promise of God declare." It does this not by virtue of the water, but by virtue of the word and the Spirit with the water. There is no dispute as to these benefits accruing to the believing adult from baptism. But faith is joined in the word with the benefits of baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Can the infant believe? Is it capable of exercising saving faith? That the infant cannot exercise *conscious* faith in the same way that the adult can seems evident. But is such conscious faith necessary to the operation of the Spirit of God through baptism on the heart of the child? It is, of course, necessary to the adult who is capable of exercising it. But is it required under all circumstances to the efficacy of baptism? May there not be a receptive faith, an unresisting disposition, a believing relation, which will meet every requirement for the bestowal of grace upon the baptized child? The preached word, through the Holy Spirit, must carry with it, even in the case of the adult, the power of faith to make it effective to the saving of the soul. No man can believe of himself. Faith is the gift of God. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," etc. So it is certainly not impossible for God to bestow upon the infant

*Rom. 10 : 13-17, and Augs. Conf., Art. V.

in connection with baptism all that is required to make that sacrament a real means of grace to the child. To give it, if you please, just the kind of faith and the amount of faith that is necessary. Whether that is the faith of the believing parent, or the believing Church, or the personal receptive faith of the child, may be left to the speculations of the dogmaticians. God certainly has not appointed a means of grace to be administered to the child, as we believe he has baptism, that is ineffectual or that cannot be made effectual by him. He most certainly also with the sacrament gives everything that is necessary to make it effectual. That the Holy Spirit can operate on the heart of the unconscious child is clearly told us in the case of Israel, Jeremiah, John the Baptist, Timothy, and has also been clearly manifest in the lives of many in the history of the Church. It is, hence, not impossible for the Holy Spirit to operate on the heart of the child through God's appointed means. There is no condition necessary which, through the grace of God, cannot be fully met by the child, or else none of these Old Testament worthies could have been "filled with the Holy Ghost from their mother's womb."

But what is baptism? It is a means of grace. But "God's Spirit is always present in the means of grace, and works saving faith in those who do not resist," in the infant as well as in the believing adult. Hence Chemnitz says: "Baptism is the laver of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Ghost, who is poured out upon the baptized, that being justified, they may become heirs of eternal life, (Tit. 3 : 5 ; Matt. 10 : 15). And this is called the faith of infants. For as the circumcision of children in the Old Testament was the seal of the righteousness of faith, so, because in the New Testament baptized infants please God, and are saved, they cannot and ought not be cast out among unbelievers, but are properly reckoned among believers." Baur adds: "It is not to be supposed that the actual benefit of regeneration, or the production of faith in infants, is to be deferred to years of discretion, and that they are in the meanwhile in no way received into grace." Martensen says: "We say that baptism is not merely the pledge (of a future regeneration), not

merely the promise and declaration of God's grace, but the bath of regeneration (Tit. 3 : 5), which involves not indeed personal, but substantial and essential regeneration. Baptism is, in fact, the beginning of the Christian life, and it must accordingly be, to use the apostle's word, the true bath of regeneration, for the final aim of the development must be included in every beginning. * * Regeneration is by no means concluded with baptism, but the foundation is therein laid, and it is not therefore baptism alone which saves, but baptism and faith: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Regeneration is completed only when the grace of baptism appears in power as *personal* regeneration."

With these dogmaticians, which I have quoted, agree the greater part of the theologians of our Church. They do not all agree perfectly as to the nature of the faith of the baptized child, nor as to the extent of the work of grace in its heart, but they do agree, in the main, that baptism is not merely the pledge of grace to be bestowed at some time in the future, but that it is the actual bestowal of saving grace. And this is evidently the import of the passages which I have already quoted from God's word in relation to baptism. These passages connect baptism most intimately and indissolubly with the *new birth, the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and the saving of the soul*. And baptism cannot be one thing to the receptive adult and quite another thing to the receptive infant. If it means the bestowal of the grace of salvation, or the germ of a new life, to the one, it must mean the same to the other. This saving grace needs Christian nurture in the child to make it personally effective when the years of accountability arrive, and it also needs Christian nurture in the case of the adult if it is to bear fruit unto eternal life and the glory of God.

One thing is most certainly true, and must be kept in mind in discussing this subject, sin has abounded to the condemnation of the unconscious child, and, consequently, grace must also in some way abound for the unconscious child for its justification, or else it cannot be truly said, "Where sin abounded, there did grace much more abound," "And as by the offence of one judgment

came upon all men to condemnation ; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Now this free gift must come also, in some way, for the justification of the child, or else a great part of our sinful race is beyond the reach of grace. But how does it come to the child according to the plan of salvation as it is manifested through Christ's Church ? Evidently through baptism, and through baptism only. Not that God cannot save outside of the pale of the Christian Church, but he has not revealed unto us any scheme of saving anybody outside of the Church. Baptism, depending for its essential power upon the command and word of God, in connection with, at least, a receptive faith or capacity for the Holy Spirit, is the means of grace which God has committed to his Church for the bestowal of grace upon the infant.

What, then, is the special efficacy of infant baptism ? "It works the forgiveness of sins." These, of course, in the infant are original only. It takes away the guilt of these, so that they are not imputed. It does not destroy concupiscence, or all tendency toward sin. The Holy Spirit who is given in baptism begins to put to death the old nature and to create new movements in the heart. "Sin is destroyed in baptism not in such a manner that it no longer exists, but so that it is not imputed."* "It frees from death and the devil." The sting of death is sin, and where there is no sin to impute, there can be no sting nor claim of the devil. "It confers everlasting salvation on all who believe." This blessing must also follow infant baptism, for how could God bestow the forgiveness of sin and still hold the forgiven as a subject of eternal death. The forgiveness of sins also implies the bestowal of life, and, at least, the germ of the new nature ; or else we would have a being which is a fit subject neither for heaven nor hell. It could not be sent to hell, for it has been forgiven ; nor yet to heaven, for it has not been born again.

"The creation of Christianity, which embraces the whole man, body, soul and spirit, must begin at some definite point when the spirit and nature first unite, a point which contains in germinal fulness what seems to be separate during man's develop-

*See Apology.

ment in time. This hidden point of life is the mystery of baptism. It cannot certainly be authenticated by any experience; but the believer who sees in baptism the complete *beginning* of the work which the Lord will finish 'in that day,' recognizes therein also not only the historical anticipation and pre-supposition of his personal life of faith, the connecting link between this life and the whole economy of revelation, not only a pledge, rich in promise, of the grace of God, but the beginning of a new relation of being between himself and the Lord, that is, a creative grace itself." (Martensen).

ARTICLE VIII.

THE CHURCH AND POPULAR SKEPTICISM.

BY PRESIDENT SAMUEL A. ORT, D. D., LL. D.

How can the Church best stem the current of the present popular skepticism? This is a timely question. There is much skepticism to-day in the world around us and in the Church. It is a bold and daring disbelief of those saving truths which characterize the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Moreover, it is an alarming question. The inquiry made presupposes the fact that the tendency adverse to Christianity and the progress of evangelical religion, is not only rapidly developing but already exists in strength and is widespread in its influence, both among the irreligious and the professors of a Christian faith. It is a high tide rolling over the land, and in its onward movement unsettling the belief of many, and seriously endangering the prosperity of the Church. Vast issues are at stake, both for the individual Christian and the body of believers. The most vital consequences are involved for this generation. If the tide is left unchecked, how disastrous the result! The republic will be shaken to its foundation and in all probability perish. The Church will sink into a state of utter effeminacy, and all the various agencies, which in their operations tend to uplift mankind into a better, happier sphere, will be paralyzed. Infidelity

found no governments, perpetuates no beneficent institutions, builds no asylums, erects no churches, and fosters no religion. It has neither guided the career of man along its upward course, nor produced that remarkable history of worthy achievement which fills the past time of human toil and struggle.

We face to-day a dangerous fact. Infidelity is here. Skepticism abounds. It is on every side. We meet it everywhere, in the Church and outside. It is a popular movement. The many are governed by its power and follow its false light.

Skepticism, What is it? Doubt. Religious skepticism, the fact now in question, What is this? Doubt of the reality and truth of those divine acts and verities which constitute the biblical system of belief. Strictly speaking, it is an attitude of mind which is neither for nor against, neither affirms nor denies, and is best described by the well known word, Agnosticism. In the common usage of the term skepticism means infidelity, disbelief, both of which are resolvable into that unbelief of the heart which is a prime characteristic of sin. Whatever be the sense in which the word is understood, it is in any case correct to say that skepticism produces, first, indifference to the truth, second, refusal to accept the truth and, third, positive opposition to the truth.

Analysis shows that skepticism is composed of two parts: form and content. The latter, namely the content, is always the same. In essence skepticism never changes. Substantially the objections urged against the Gospel of Jesus Christ, against the inspiration of the Scriptures and the Bible as a divine revelation, against a real incarnation of the Son of God, against an actual atonement for sin, in short, against all those divine acts which are the essential elements of a scheme of redemption,—these objections are now, as they always have been, either Ebionitic, that is Judaistic, or Doketic, that is heathen. There have been only two opponents and rejectors of Christianity: Judaism and heathenism. All skepticism as to contents is reducible to either the one or the other. The form, however, is variable, according to the type and tone of the prevailing philosophy at a given time, or of the speculations of natural science. For example,

in the eighteenth century the Sensational Philosophy produced the Deism of England, the Rationalism of Germany and the Infidelity of France, while in the present century theories of natural science have given caste to many of the skeptical forms of religious view which abound.

With these preliminary remarks I pass on to inquire:

What has contributed and is now contributing to the production of the present popular skepticism? My answer, for one thing, is a certain way of scientific thinking about nature.

The human mind ever seeks for the reason of things, that is, a sufficient explanation for all its facts of knowledge. In our century no subject has received more diligent, persistent and severe study than the natural world. With this object man is constantly in direct contact. It seems to him more close and real than any other because it is part of his own existence, and because he always touches it. He finds himself so linked with it in all his life, so dependent on its ministrations for his comfort and progress that quite easily it is for him a subject of absorbing interest. What is this world of nature? more especially, How has it been produced? What is the method of its development? This is the one pressing inquiry the scientific mind aims to answer. After patient search it is now able to make reply. The process for making a universe of natural objects as these have been in the various stages of their growth and as they now are, is known. This process is labeled, evolution.

In answer to the question, how have all natural existences arisen? how taken on the forms they wear? and why do they stand related one to the other as the members of an ascending series? it is affirmed, by a method of development which requires that one member of this series be worked out of the preceding one, so that each individual is a resultant of all those that have preceded it. Since all objects of sense must be accounted for by the evolutionary process of development, man, who is also an object of sense perception, must, in the beginning of his existence as well as in the progress of his life, be subject to the same explanation. It is easy to see how, through such teaching, man is finally esti-

mated, in the basis of his existence, to be physical. He results from a long course of natural growth. His deepest needs, hence, are physical wants whose satisfaction can be gained only through the operation of physical agencies.

Under such view, the chief maxim becomes, "Appropriate nature." The fuller the appropriation, the happier one's life. Nature and her ways are supreme for man. The human creature is but a child of the natural world, to be "nourished and developed into a thing of excellent beauty by the sweet and loving care of natural energy." Why then concern ourselves about a world of supernatural realities? If such a world exists, what is that to us? We belong to the sphere of nature existence and are able to account for our being here on solely natural grounds. It is with nature we have to do. We are of it. We are out of it. We are what it has made us, and we can only become in the endless future what it, in its ceaseless energizing, is able to produce. Nothing is so essential to man, nothing so valuable, as nature. The more of it he can bring into his experience, the more he can incorporate in his life, the more desirable his existence, the more comfortable his state, and the happier his years. On his part, hence, the wise thing to do, is to give himself in his entire living to the pursuit of nature and its ends, to work for nature's pay, and thus gain for himself as much as possible of nature's goods, while he moves *from* he knows not whence to he knows not whither. For him the realm of spiritual facts is a world of dreams, the passing shadow of a distempered brain.

Under the influence of this undue emphasis and exaltation of the natural, much of that popular skepticism with which, in our professional pursuits, we are familiar, takes its rise. How forcibly every day we are impressed with the fact that the tendency of the present time is to sensualize everything. In education materialistic utility is foremost. The young man of to-day wishes that knowledge which will help to get most largely and quickly natural goods. I desire, he says, to pursue that calling in which I can get the most money. The ruling thought is, not self-development for his own sake and because of what he is as a moral, personal being, but the getting of physical goods that he may

satisfy to the fullest measure the craving of bodily appetite and enjoy without limit the emotions of sensuous pleasure. To gain this world is the summum bonum, the right meaning and true value of human existence. All perfectly legitimate, if out of nature he has come and back to nature again returns.

In religion and the Church the same is observable. Here, too, the sensuous is ever thrusting itself forward as the chief motive for even the mechanical performance of duty. Fairs, suppers, entertainments of divers sorts, with all the various physical machinery, are employed, sometimes under the name of applied Christianity, to arrest the attention of the passer by, to stimulate the church member and to develop the Christian in the graces of a godly life. And why all this physical energizing in order to win people from evil ways and induce them to be good? Why is the Gospel sensualized in order to get men and women of to-day to do Christian acts? Is it not because they have lost faith in the reality of the spiritual and are moved in their living by the delusion that nature is God? Is it not because of this naturalistic conception of things heavenly, crude though it may be when in popularized form, that the Church finds it so difficult to get the ear of the masses and then makes the sad mistake of trying to conform the religion of Christianity to the sensuous notions of the day? No wonder the battle against the wickedness and ungodliness of men goes hard, and the enemy is proud and boastful of his strength. SAMSON IS SHORN OF HIS LOCKS WHILE RESTING HIS HEAD IN THE LAP OF DELILAH.

Concerning the production of the prevailing skepticism of our time, I state, for a second thing, a teaching of some religious thinkers of to-day, both in the pulpit and out of it. These thinkers accepting the present conclusions of natural science, especially concerning man, suppose that the needful revelation has at last been given, and that now all those dark questions relating to the human creature, in his origin and progressive development, can be readily solved. The actual method of the production of all things has at last been found and, hence, a different and more satisfactory account of the coming of the several

kingdoms of nature into existence can be given. In the application of the theory of evolution, such use is made of it, that supernatural agency falls far into the back ground and finally vanishes from view altogether. Nothing is left for the course of things save natural force. Take a present phase of thought on this question. It is about as follows: The body of man at least is the resultant of the evolutionary process. No divine agency was present at the formation of the human physical organism. Through the long ages it was in process of becoming. Natural law, natural selection, natural energy, was back of all movements steadily working to reach the ultimate climax, man's body. Forth from an original germ endowed with all potency of natural existence, at last it came, the body of man, perfect in its form, the master-workmanship of nature's artistic skill. Through all this long history of outworking of the potential seed, no divine hand guided the movement. None was needed. The original germ contained within itself all possible nature existences. When in the ongoing of this evolving method a transition was made from one order of creature to another, no agency was present other than the original force with its accumulated momentum. God made the primal energy with its inherent possibilities, and then, having set it working, withdrew to be an observer of its operations. And this is Deism.

The Biblical view of evolution is clearly that God was omnipotently present at every divisional stage of the world making process. The new was not the old worked into a fresh form, but the old with an energy superinduced, which had not yet been. Every stage of the process which marked the beginning of a kind was a creation and not a development. The Biblical view is that God is in the world originating a world developing process from beginning to end.

In the light of the foregoing naturalistic view we can readily see why so many here and there are saying, "We don't believe what the Bible says about the creation of man, is true. God didn't make his body; nature produced it." How probable also the inference, that since the supernatural is not in this long history of the development of the universe up to the appearance of

man, there is no special reason to believe that God is directly concerned about men and their ways. But if he is not in and through his universe at all points of its progress, introducing that which is new, preserving the old, and directing his entire work, rational and irrational creatures, to a glorious destiny, the conception of creatorship falls away, for it is inconceivable that a wise, good and benevolent God should never show himself to be anything more than a mere toy maker.

If now in the making of the body of the first Adam the creative power of God was not immediately present, the highest and most glorious work of the original creation, and it is to be accounted for solely by the operation of natural cause, what shall we say of the body of the Second Adam? Was not this also the result of the evolutionary process? Why should it not be? If the beginner of the old race was as to his body, to say no more, the product of development and not a creation of God, are we not justified in holding that the beginner of the new race was likewise a natural evolution? What more need for the direct formative power of the Most High God in the production of the latter, than the former, the Second Adam, than the first? None. And this is precisely the conclusion which skepticism draws. When consequently religious teachers fall in with certain views of evolution which aim to exclude God as far as possible from the realm of his creature and adjust their instruction of the people as closely as they can in harmony with naturalistic belief, they are, perhaps unawares, promoting the spread of infidelity. If they do not draw the logical conclusion from the premises they lay down for their hearers, some of their hearers will undoubtedly do it for themselves. It is a dangerous thing to unsettle the foundations.

Again, some religious teachers proclaim with much ardor the ideal Christ. And who is this ideal Christ? Not the historic Jesus of Nazareth. He was only the member of a series, who, more than any other member, has approximated the fulness of the ideal. The essential Christ, the Christ all perfect, without spot or wrinkle, is the human race at the climax of perfection,—the Judaistic conception of the Messiah applied to the whole hu-

man family. This is the Christ of humanitarianism, of whom so much is said to-day in speech and print. No wonder the popular mind loses interest in the old Gospel which shows us humanity already perfected in Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of man.

Besides all this, Higher Criticism is making no small contribution to the infidelity of our time. We are all familiar with its claims. Its logical outcome is unbelief. The legitimate conclusion has been drawn and stated by its leaders, Reuss, Kuenen and Wellhausen, and these conclusions are the same as those of Tom Paine and Voltaire. In the end Higher Criticism, like every form of disbelief, repudiates the incarnation. If the eternal Son of God was not manifested in the flesh, then the only true ground for inspiration of prophet and apostle does not exist. Higher Criticism finds that the Sacred Scriptures are not inspired. It, hence, has no place for incarnation. If Jesus Christ is the incarnate Son of God, then in him human nature is inspired and the revelation which God gives to man through him is a revelation by inspiration. It could not be otherwise.

The trend of Higher Criticism is skeptical, and the conclusion of its skepticism is to sweep away the very foundation of Christianity, the God-Man, Christ Jesus. Some Higher critics, and some who endorse their views, do not go to the full length of this later phase of doubt, and still cling to the old, well tried doctrines of the Gospel; but they are traveling on a strange road, whose guide-posts are misleading, and will, in all probability, some day find themselves at the terminus of a way they thought had no end. Unfortunately for sound belief there are in the pulpit to-day those who exhibit to the people in favorable terms the teachings of Higher Criticism. The fruit of this sowing is already beginning to be apparent in the spread of that skepticism which has little, if any, respect for the Bible as the inspired record of a divine revelation.

The destructive teaching of the new criticism is pleasing speech to the natural man, and quickly moves him to say: "I always thought that was the truth about the old book, and now my judgment is confirmed by the discoveries of the latest critical

science." The old man is a persistent skeptic because he wants to be. The natural heart is prone to doubt. This no doubt is chief among the reasons why now so much disbelief in the Church and out of it prevails.

But the remedy, what is it? I answer, first, not the wisdom of this world. Excellent as this may be in its proper sphere, still it is not sufficient to cure the unbelief of the age. It is itself a great skeptic; for does it not account the cross a shame and the preaching of the cross foolishness? Besides, the most refined literary, scientific and æsthetic culture cannot check and put down the infidelity of the time. This too is full of doubt about spiritual facts. It has no eye with which to see beyond the horizon of nature's realm, and instead of helping to restrain the skepticism of the day only supports its claims.

Still further, the infidelity of to-day cannot be stopped in its course by sheer argument. The Church might resolve herself into a debating society and argue most profoundly against unbelief, but still the natural man would be of the same opinion as before. Argument will not convince him; logic will not change him. Whenever the Church gives her time and strength to controversy, doubt and disbelief flourish vigorously.

Still less is the skepticism of the present to be halted by an adaptation of the fundamental, saving truths of the Gospel to the false conceptions of this world. In some quarters, it seems, this is now being tried. It is a foolish attempt. "The words that I speak to you they are spirit and they are life." But it must never be forgotten that these words are spirit and life only as framed by their divine author. When changed to correspond with the speech of the unregenerate mind, they are no longer God's message of wisdom and power, but the frail and erring speech of sinful man. To change the doctrines of revelation or to modify them so as to please the natural understanding, is to yield the contest and surrender to the enemy. And this the Church of Jesus Christ, that Church which he bought with his own blood, cannot, dare not do. She must ever marshal before the foe an uncompromising host.

What the Church needs to do now, in or order to stem the

tide of the current skepticism, is to live a pure and holy life. She dare not countenance little sins or be indifferent to whatever defiles. She must be a fit temple for God. She must watch herself and be sure that she is undefiled. Is her own life what it ought to be? Is it pure, is it holy? If not, then she is weak. Oh, so weak! In such condition how can she grapple the strong man of sin and hold him captive? She is in danger of being taken prisoner herself and losing her heritage.

But the Church must not only be pure and holy, she must also live a life of faith. In the presence of faith, skepticism is powerless. The quibbles and false reasoning of the natural understanding concerning spiritual realities are easily swept away. The doubts of the unbelieving heart are quickly silenced. By faith the Church has won her victories. By faith she triumphed over heathenism. By faith she came forth again in the sixteenth century to run the race of victory. By faith she overcame the Deism of the eighteenth century and the rationalism of a later day. By faith she routed the hosts of infidelity in our own land in the days of Jonathan Edwards. By faith, ever living faith, the Church of God in every age has stemmed the tide of current skepticism and saved the generations of her time from the wreck and ruin of infidelity. "This is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith." If the tide of skepticism now rolling over our land, carrying with it thousands and thousand of the people, will ever be turned back, the millions on this western continent be rescued from its destructive march, and the Church come forth again, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun and terrible as an army with banners," it will only be because a living faith is supreme in the lives of God's people. What the Church needs to-day in order that she may meet her old enemy on the field of battle and vanquish him, is the power of an endless life, that life of which Paul speaks, when he says: "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me." Life! Ah, yes, that is the irresistible power. Before this nothing can stand. The world, the flesh and the devil have no might to

match it. In every age this it is, the life which is Christ living in us, that has "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness and put to flight the armies of aliens." Has the Church this power to-day? Then she need not fear. The final issue is certain. She can easily stem the tide of a current infidelity and win to the standard of King Immanuel millions of souls. On the other hand, has she little of this power? then is she in a state of alarm, trembles with fear, is perplexed to know what to do and in her distress cries out, "What can I do to stem this tide of skepticism? to hold back and put down this enemy of Christ and mine?" Do? Is this the anxious inquiry of the Church in America? I answer: "Put on the whole armor of God." Put on the helmet of salvation, to protect the head against the blows of doubt; the breastplate of love, to guard the heart against the assaults of unbelief; and then take in the one hand the shield of faith with which to ward off the fiery darts of the adversary and in the other the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, and, like her Great Captain, she can face the forces of infidelity in successful battle, win the age for God and achieve for herself spotless renown.

In order that this blessed state of the Church may be realized more and more, and that she may be strong in the Lord, brethren, be sure to preach a sound Gospel. Not a gospel which teaches that sin is a mere accident, or chiefly a radical disturbance in man's physical organism, or an imperfection of the finite creature, but a gospel which reveals the true nature of sin through the life, sufferings and death of the Incarnate Son of God;—not a gospel that magnifies divine love in such a way that the eternal righteousness of God is minimized, but a gospel which is the revelation of the divine righteousness against all ungodliness and wickedness of men, and that is the power of God unto salvation unto every one who believes,—the gospel, which a human race, lost in sin, needs,—the gospel of a Christ who died for us and rose for our justification, and who assures his Church: "Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." This is the Gospel that can convict sinners, edify believers and save the world.

ARTICLE IX.

THE PRESENT STRUGGLE OVER THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Lecture delivered in Berlin, Jan. 13th, 1896, by Prof. Cettli, Professor of Theology in Griefswald University.*

Translated by REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A. M.

There was a solemn crowd assembled at the house of Jahve, in Bethel, the seat of the empire and the royal sanctuary. Altars smoked and hymns resounded to honor the God who had brought the ruler of the land, Jeroboam II., victory and safety. The sacrificial feasts were in course on every hand. Suddenly there appeared before the motley rejoicing assembly a man who had wandered in from Judah, a simple shepherd and peasant, and began a hymn of lamentation: "The virgin of Israel is fallen, she shall no more rise; she is forsaken upon her ground and there is none to raise her up." This evil must break upon them because in their land they trod right with their feet, imposed upon the poor and the needy and tried to satisfy their God with the outward service of offering. He who sent it upon them is none other than Jahve himself, for he holds just scales over all nations. Amos can prophesy it with perfect certainty, for the Lord Jahve does nothing unless he reveals his counsel to his servants, the prophets. He had taken him away from behind his flocks in Hebron and had given him the commission: "Go prophesy against my people Israel." Thus he became a herald of the day of Jahve who would bring the destruction of the state through the Assyrians, but at the same time sifting with the judgment, for behind the dark clouds that were collecting Amos saw bits of light on the horizon's edge. Only the chaff will be scattered, the good grain remains, and at the end of the days the house of David will be gloriously established.

*His standpoint may be taken as representative of the most conservative professors of Old Testament work in the universities of Germany, which means that he accepts the Old Testament as a book from God and at the same time some of the results of higher criticism.

TRANS.

This scene places the religion of Israel before our eyes in a picture that is easily surveyed. Is it *true* that a call from a higher world laid hold of this man? Did he speak of and by the counsel of his God or from his own breast? Is this a living God who deals with his people in grace and judgment, and with wisdom and goodness; and with righteousness and power directs the destinies of all nations toward a premeditated goal? These are the questions about which the present struggle concerning the Old Testament centers. The noise of the conflict has long passed beyond the circles of the schools and has penetrated the congregation, unsettling and shaking many. Therefore it is well worth our while to clearly state the question and to answer it: Concerning what does this struggle really contend? Particularly in regard to this are important misunderstandings in vogue that require consideration.

Primarily the question is not concerning the doctrine of the *divine inspiration of the holy Scriptures* as applied to the Old Testament. This doctrine grew out of the necessity of making the peculiar religious effects that come from the Bible intelligible. For these effects do not cease to be if that doctrine in its established form proves to be untenable. The word that is like fire and the hammer that crushes rocks does not need for its verification a human theory as to its origin. The question is also not concerning the *literary questions* which give the Old Testament over to historical investigation. According to the nature of the matter these must remain in the hands of those who have the necessary tools for such work, *i. e.* the knowledge of the language and history. And it brings no good results when, presumably in the interests of faith, those who can neither know nor appreciate the present questions, trespass on this branch. Whether the Pentateuch is all from Moses, or the book of Isaiah comes wholly from the prophet Isaiah, may be submitted to the discussion of the specialists. He who does not belong to the profession can satisfy himself by nourishing his inner life on the one as well as the other of these works. If he feels the Holy Spirit of God in it, the assertions of the learned concerning it affect him rather indifferently, for this experience is infinitely more

important than the understanding of the circumstances of the composition of those writings. On the other hand, if he does not experience the witness of the Spirit in itself, the assertion of their inspiration and authenticity cannot help him much. Certainly a reverential attitude to the Scriptures corresponding to the confessions of the Church forms a favorable condition for their spiritual and personal apprehension, but never an equivalent for this as some seem to think.

The question in the present struggle concerning the Old Testament touches, in fact, much greater and more important things than the rightness of the established doctrine of inspiration and the Jewish-Christian tradition concerning individual books. The question is concerning *the truth of the whole Old Testament religion and concerning its relation to Christianity*. And I think that I cannot present it to you better than by picturing in concise lines the course of development, which, according to the chief representatives of the new school (Kuenen, Wellhausen, Stade), the religion of Israel took. On our side we will then examine this picture critically and test the justification of its claim, that here for the first time has been gained the correct view of the remarkable phenomenon of ancient religious history. We will accordingly let the critics speak first.

The religion of Israel begins with the existence of the people Israel. That which Genesis has to relate of an earlier step of Jahve worship is in truth the religion of the later time of the prophets, for the patriarchs were only the characters of the free creative popular tradition. Much rather was the religion of the tribes out of which Israel's unity as a people gradually grew of very different origin. They formed the Semitic heathendom, which was hereditary from the individual fragment to the lower national form of the Jahve religion. It consisted in worship of the dead, veneration of ancestors, and animal, stone and star worship, and was a kind of animism* or pandemonism, by which

*Not that of Stahl that made "the soul the proper principle of life and development in the body," but the term used to designate "a perverted veneration of spirits and belief in ghosts that lies at the foundation of all natural religions."—TRANS.

the possibility is not excluded that the deity of one or the other of these clans was already called Jahve, originally the storm-god that in storm traveled through the air. For reasons unknown to us there was an emigration toward the east of several tribes that had settled at the delta of the Nile. On their way others joined them forming a league and the sacred place Kadesh that lies deep in southern Canaan became their central point. What part in this movement belongs to one or several leading men is not to be ascertained. The Moses of the later Jewish tradition is a form of very uncertain outline, and, if he ever existed at all, was no law-giver but an administrator of right and a leader in war. The unification of the tribes had of course also a religious side. It was the recognition of the God Jahve, who dwelt on Sinai, as the real patron of this tribal alliance. However, beside him the former clan deities claim their existence and worship proximately undisputed. The overcoming of Canaan followed different attacks on the part of the several tribes, not by a common action. The invaders united with the former population that had not been exterminated, even in religious matters, so that the religion of ancient Israel presents a compromise between the incoming Semitic form and the former native worship of God. Jahve, who was generally thought of as God of war, able to help and present in the sacred treasury, a much venerated palladium, was merged with Baal, the god of the land, so that it was hard to distinguish them. In fact on several occasions it went so far that he almost supplanted Baal; if in the first place the needs of war on the part of the Canaanites had not united the loosely bound tribes, then for years the Philistines accomplished it by the watchword of Jahve's name. "The Philistines awaken Israel and Jahve from slumber," said Wellhausen very significantly. When at last the victory of Jahve and Israel was decided, the more peaceful attributes of Baal, together with his symbols and customs of worship and cities, were transferred to Jahve. And the service was not essentially different from Baal's. He became straightway the chief deity of the land to whom they must pay homage with the fruits of the earth at the ancient holy cities, on high places, in Bethel,

Dan, Gilgal, Mizpah, and others. He was honored with sacrifices, probably even human offerings, and with festivals of nature, exactly as the neighboring peoples honored their gods. And in return he gave rain to his people and harvest and wine in times of peace, and help and victory in war. Even the sacred stones and pillars and, before all, the images of oxen were appropriated for the service of Jahve, and were viewed as wholly unobjectionable. When Jahve was worshiped at different places and with different local attributes, the danger of breaking up into several deities threatened him. And since the relation of Israel to Jahve was merely a national one and limited to cult, no important ethical effects came from it.

Not until the prophets of the eighth century was the first crude form of the people's religion overcome. They were really the creators of all that thus far has generally been known as the work of Moses. The service of an Amos, a Hosea, an Isaiah, consisted in this: they loosened the bond between Jahve and Israel and brought the religion over from the realm of mere cult to that of morals, and they even moralized the conception of God. Now Jahve is no longer the God of Israel in the sense that his people's fortune and power are a proof of his existence and greatness, and their misfortune an evidence of his weakness, but he rules over his people and all the nations that come in contact with them, and applies to all a like standard of unchangeable righteousness. The service that he demands is not that of the outward cult—such he rather rejects—but morality, and probably of the same extent and depth as is seen in the formulation of the individual requirements of the decalogue (which came into being about this time), particularly that of right and fairness in daily walk and conversation. The revealers of the purposes of Jahve are his trustworthy servants, the prophets who were called upon to prophesy the downfall of the ten tribes and later that of Judah.

In the first place the prophets, with their fine conception of religion, did not leaven all. There was rather a compromise between the religion of the prophets and the previous religion of the people in Deuteronomy, which, in truth, strongly emphasized

the unity and peculiarity and even the spirituality of Jahve, but it also brought the cult to a more honorable place, and that in a strongly centralized form, and consequently gave the prophets again a place behind the priests. Thus the first step was taken toward making the religion fast in legal form—toward monism. In the place of the living, inspired word of the prophets was found the sacred codex which regulated and bound the religion. Both the prophetic and priestly tendencies were continued in exile, the former most excellently in Deutero Isaiah, who developed the conception of God sharply monotheistic, the latter in laws of sanctity, and by Ezekiel, both creating a legal expression for the sanctity of Israel. Finally the priestly tendency won the over-hand, though it, by its neglecting of morality in the interests of cult, meant really a decline into heathenism. Its great document is the priestly law that fills the middle part of the Pentateuch. When this was made canon and raised to the highest norm of life after the return from Babylon about the middle of the fifth century, the prophetic breath, that had held the religion alive, died, and even morality degenerated into mere dogma-existence or wretched letter-service, beside which, strange as it may seem, there sprung up an eccentric Messianic hope.

Since Jeremiah, who already stood with one foot in the decline of the external state, the religion was no more considered as merely national but was regarded as a personal affair, and they began to distinguish people as pious or godly according to their supposed relation to Jahve. In Psalms, Proverbs and Job, which are merely post-exilic writings, this undercurrent of personal morality and piety shows itself; but in the later period it was almost smothered by the dogmatics, and scholasticism and cult of Judaism.

This, with the passing over of all that is non-essential, is the religiously historical hypothesis of the new school. The idea of development is determinative for its perfection. And in this is founded its relative rightness and the charm which it works over growing circles. It contains an element of truth in comparison with, and in opposition to, that untenable view according to which Israel's religion came forth as a completed thing already

in the time of Moses, so that the men of God of a later period were to assert that which was already present, or at most to re-establish obscured truths. That contradicts every historic analogy, yes, we can even say God's entire method of dealing. All spiritual life grows up (and herein, like the life of the body,) from productive germs in full relation to, and in reciprocal action with the factors of its spiritual surroundings, to its full stature. It is not sent down into this world as a perfect product of art, but it brings with it the ways of an organism which, animated by a peculiar principle of growth, forms the more perfect from that which is more simple, and the noble from that which is unseemly. But the question intrudes itself whether the use of the idea of development, which *per se* is unassailable, was made here in the proper way. We dispute that very decidedly. This is the first point at which we raise a contradiction to the findings of the modern school.

How is the idea of religious development considered here? They simply apply to the realm of spiritual and religious life the scheme of spontaneous evolution which has been raised to a self-evident axiom for the explaining of life in nature. No effect can appear for which there is not present a known and adequate cause. The already existent things, or spirits, work upon each other according to their peculiar method, and by this new forms come into being which again bring still others into existence. This movement is blind, guided by no purpose, yet probably placed under the command of an honorable necessity. And the forms of religious thought follow one another, in their way, under a similar conformity to law, to that which through a thousand intervening steps causes the complex organic structure to come from the simple organic cell. And since there is nowhere a leap, there happens in reality nothing new. That which takes place before our eyes is merely the summing up of factors already present. In the realm of religion the animating power of this movement is human thinking. It smooths off by degrees the rough, contradictory characteristics of the idea of God, refines it, ennobles it, and decorates it with moral characteristics taken from human morality; and the idea of God thus formed

works reflexively on these qualities, purifying them. So the whole process becomes plausible, clear and intelligible. As soon as the first member is known one can run it off on a string, so to speak. First is the deity lost in the life of nature, and in itself not a unit; then in connection with the forming of firmer tribal alliances the god of a clan thought of as inseparably connected with that clan; when the clans grow together into a people the national god that enters into a special relation to his people and land and possibly unites himself to some previously found deity of the country; after this, in conflict with the neighboring peoples and their gods, the stronger god that reaches out over the boundaries of his original sphere of power; then with rising culture the moral god, to whom is imparted the nobler human traits of character; and still further, with the widening of the circle of vision over the entire world, the just God who directs history; and, finally, with the still further advanced reflection and abstraction, the one God and Creator of all, who does not tolerate him who loves another god. In this way are the religious heights of the Old Testament easily ascended, and everything in it goes very naturally. But does the reality correspond to this picture? We will test the theory on three points that seem to us to be decisive: *The religious founding of Israel in the time of Moses; the claimed moralizing of the idea of God by the prophets; and the continuation, yes, perfecting, of the Jahve faith in the exile.*

The more remote the religious step of the pre-Mosaic time is placed,—and many critics can scarcely do enough just here—the more astounding is the advance reached here with one stroke. One may view the “sources” with ever so critical an eye, Jahve, the God of Israel whom Moses preached, is from the very beginning loose and free from any binding with nature, a free spiritual personality, a redeeming God, and a God of right, whose hand is felt in the history of his people and who wants to make their life a mirror of his own holy being. How did this God grow up out of the Semitic Pantheon or Pandemonium? The Egyptian or Midian certificate of birth that a fanciful science

gave him, has been torn to pieces by sober investigation. There is no explanation, not even a "natural" one, for the fact that from the common ground of Jewish heathendom only at this point such a religious development arose, which, although borne by an unimportant nation, surpassed all the religions of the racially related peoples. Why did not Kamosh, of the Moabites, or Milkrom, of the Ammonites, or why did not the gods of the world-wide empires, Anu and Nabu, rather ascend the throne of the world? Why did Jahve alone, from the hour when his name first shone into history, bear the seal of imperishable divinity on his forehead? It sounds almost like sport when a man wants to make the religious genius of Moses or of some other the generating source for the living, salvation-bringing God of Israel. That is merely to change the name of the riddle, not to solve it. No, the only thing that helps us is the simple acknowledgment that if Moses knew and preached this God, this God had borne a new and wonderful witness of himself in his spirit. And with this is the notion of natural development broken already at its starting point.

It was not different in the ninth and eighth centuries. Under the Omris the power of the state, the kingdom, the priesthood, the guild of the prophets and the mass of the people stood on the side of Baal, and the uprooting of Jahve seemed to be completed. There came one man in the name of just this Jahve against the whole power of the state and won the victory for Jahve. Was that the fruit of a "natural" development? And whence did Amos, Hosea and Isaiah win their deep insight into the being of Jahve, if they as children of their people from their homes overcame such an unrefined idea of God? According to that notion the indeterminable, morally indifferent God of the people becomes all at once the powerful protector of right, who gives his own people over to decline when they work the eternal rule of his righteousness—a thought elsewhere unheard of on the ground of the ancient peoples' religions. Elsewhere the gods of the heathen nations bear the marks of the people's character or their appearance. The God of these prophets stood in such a marked contrast to his people Israel that they must

perish just because of their relation to Jahve. Isaiah, the most powerful preacher of this God, who in sublime sanctity rules over the world of nations, is seized with deadly terror at his spiritual meeting with him. "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips and dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts." And in the face of all that, the new knowledge of God is to have sprouted out very naturally from reflection in the minds of these men! No! but the living and gracious God touched their eyes and gave them a deeper insight into his heart.

Finally, the exile meant death to Israel as a people. What returned later to the old home was only a needy remnant without national independence. Now it is unheard of in all the ancient world that a nation's god survived his people's downfall. If the nationality breaks down the religion comes to an end and gives place to new formations or resolves itself into philosophical speculation which lacks religious warmth and power and is accessible only to a few select minds. But instead of this we see here in the midst of the destruction of the Israelitish national existence the belief in Jahve reaching its greatest perfection under the prophets of the exile. In the entire Old Testament there is nothing more powerful and more striking than that which we hear from the great book of comfort to the exiles—the song of praise of the lordly Creator and God of redemption who brings his servant to perfection through suffering and prepares for the Mediator of salvation for Israel and the world. Whence from all the world came such knowledge to Israel trodden under foot in Babylon? They did not get it from their own hearts, desperately despondent and for that purpose weighed down under guilt, but the prophet himself confessed it: "The Lord Jahve and his Spirit sent and empowered me to bring glad tidings to the suffering." Here, therefore, as in both the cases mentioned before, the theory of development denies every reasonable explanation of the facts in the case at hand, and then it is much wiser to suit the theory to the history than to reconstruct the history according to the theory.

There is a second and still more important consideration that brings us into pronounced opposition to the most influential spokesmen of the new school. They present the source of the religious development of Israel in such a way as if the history of religious thought was the only thing at stake. They speak of a more or less pure conception of Jahve, of a more or less developed idea of God, and on the other hand the question seems scarcely to have touched them as to whether a divine reality corresponds to these interesting forms of thought, whether the God discovered and thought of by Israel, one might almost say whether the God worked out by Israel, also existed. This most important thing *per se* they purposely have covered under an impenetrable veil. And yet just here lies the fundamental question of all religion. Religion does not live from an accurately constructed, unobjectionable *idea of God*. Its rallying cry sounds: My soul thirsteth after the *living* God! If, then, as it often seems here, the limits of mankind are never crossed by even a hairbreadth, the religion of Israel remains indeed a notable phantom in the history of the human mind, but *its inner truth is destroyed*. Without hesitation we place it on the same level with the mythologies of other ancient peoples. It avails us nothing if we admit the idea of *revelation* as an indispensable hypothesis, but explain it in such a way that it is perfected in the development of the religious spirit and covers itself with it. For that presupposes an immanence of God in man's spirit and in the course of human history, which is very far removed from the belief in the God of the Bible, and is able to explain neither the reaching by leaps of the higher steps, nor entirely the declines and deformities in the realm of religion, which are also not wanting in Israel. Here we do not come out at all without the assumption of a serious and supernatural revelation of God. For example, we must attribute to the prophets the most inexplicable illusion, if not something worse, as soon as we do not recognize as essentially true the formula that is so common in their mouth: "Thus spake the Lord Jahve." This is not the place to penetrate into the secret of the prophetic consciousness, but we dare determine that the sources of their religion accord-

ing to their testimony, which is clear as sunlight, and the sources of their special enlightenment, lay not in their own spirit but in a transcendental world of divine reality miraculously revealed unto them.

With this conception the proper idea of development is quite consistent, only that in the light of revelation the development now presents itself as an education. Also, from the standpoint of the strongest belief in revelation we have not the least concern to gainsay natural mediations and starting points, *i. e.* such as are founded in the laws of the spiritual life, and to make everything magically new and wonderful, or perhaps to carry back into the Old Testament the clear cognitions that brought us the Gospel, and thus obliterate the steps in the history of the children of Israel.

That which is right in the picture of development that we have just drawn, we gladly acknowledge. But we view it in a very different light; not as a spontaneous upward striving of man's mind from crude error to more purified forms of thought, but as a progressive disclosure of self by God in the field of revelation, as a divine work of construction on a material generally unsympathetic and opposing. It is the same God who revealed himself to Abraham and Moses, to Elias and Isaiah. He is none other than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and our God. He is the same to the fathers and to the children, and condescending and kind he enters into the conditions of man's spiritual life which he himself set. He reveals himself to children as they are able to understand him, and to men as befits them. He does not clear away with one wrench every obstruction and all hindrances, but overcomes them gently and with patience, working from within outward. Nor does he destroy with one stroke of magic all strange elements that his revelation finds present in the spirits of its receivers, but has it depend upon the working of the measure of the knowledge of God and experience that he can give from time to time as a ferment which in time of itself rejects those strange elements.

If we attempt to view the history of Israel from this standpoint, the wonder is that so much inadequate and imperfect still

clings to it. On the one hand the theoretical attempt to prove such things perfect and in harmony with God, and valid for all time, is given up. And on the other hand the insipid mockery of a God, full of pleasure and smelling of the odor of offerings that must testify of his earthly relations by a personal appearance, and who has his court in heaven, ceases to be known. For one detects in the childlike method of expression the warm pulsation of the *living* God who can sit on his throne and descend from heaven only because he can love and really give himself for the world. And at this God no one takes offence who has felt a want of divine love.

That which separates us from the new school, aside from disputing their speculative idea of evolution, is a third and very important difference. They break asunder the relation between the Old Testament and the New Testament. According to them the Old Testament religious development ended in ruin. The post-exilian nomism is a decline into heathenism. The inwardness and spirituality of the religion of the prophets died in lifeless forms and dogmas. And in its stead, they further claim, is a poor equivalent—the Messianic dreaming which luxuriously sprung up from this spiritual desert and which would like to awaken the irretrievably sunken national glory to a semblance of life, at least for the future. The most important Messianic prophecies, in the narrower sense, are pushed down into late post-exilian times by the most advanced critics, and branded as error. Those among these investigators who think highly of Jesus for this reason busy themselves to separate him as thoroughly as possible from the Messianic expectations of his contemporaries, to sever the threads entirely that run back from his religious consciousness into the religion of the Old Testament. The assertion is by no means unheard of in their camp: Jesus thought of nothing less than to want to be the Messiah of the prophets. And thus the appearance is now that the joining of Christianity to the religion of the Old Testament was only an incidental thing, merely an historical consecution, but not inward and necessary, in the sense that in reality one and the same religious development runs through the whole Bible and makes

the Gospel the consummation of Israel's faith. Then Jesus stood just as near Hellenism, if not nearer, than he stood to Judaism. They have already begun to draw the practical results of this depreciation of the Old Testament. Men object to the worth of the Old Testament as a means of upbuilding. From the schools they speak in the interests of their estrangement and find a hundred perversities and inconsistencies to bring up against it.

Over against this we will place the question: Why do we interest ourselves at all for the Old Testament? He who is willing to hear the testimony of Jesus and his witnesses knows why. It is because the beginner and perfecter of our faith nourished his inner life on these writings; because by them he had moulded his consciousness as Saviour and King; because not one important idea of the Gospel of Christ and his apostles has its root elsewhere than in the Old Testament; and because, according to his own words, salvation comes from the Jews and eternal life is to be found in their writings because they testify of him. The witnesses of Jahve in Israel all knew that they stood in a stream of divine thoughts and institutions that was not to run into oblivion in the sand, but would lead to a glorious goal of perfect self impartation of God to man. Every one in his own way—sometimes stammering, sometimes speaking clearly—pointed to him who fulfilled the purpose of Israel and satisfied the yearnings of the heathen. The law also with its confining discipline prepared for him who should come, for it brought knowledge of sin before the Saviour from sin. There is needed indeed a wonderful estrangement from the biblical spirit in order to be blind to this divinely-willed continuity in the two Testaments, and to want to sever what God has bound together. And no one can depreciate the Old Testament in this way without, as a just retribution, shutting the door of his mind to a sense for the true content of the New.

These, honored hearers, seem to me to be the chief positions at which the discussion concerning the Old Testament is aimed. This struggle, as every other contest of minds, will not be decided by carnal weapons, by decrees of proscription and by vio-

lent measures from without. The spirits that have the field here must live and work themselves out, then it will be evident whether the Old Testament contains a living witness of God's work for God's people, or merely a valuable collection of material for the religious history of the ancient world. But those on whose hearts this question lies can test for themselves and investigate and delve, and that more energetically than before, whether they were not led by the voice of the sacred singer and the prophets of Israel to David's Son, and then in turn by him pointed back to the temple halls of the old covenant on which there lay already a morning beam of divine glory.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

IMPORTED BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Philosophy of Belief, or Law in Christian Theology. By the Duke of Argyll, K. G., K. T. pp. 535. Price \$5.00.

This work, though complete in itself, is to be regarded as the concluding one of a series by the author, the first of which was *The Reign of Law*, published in 1866, and the second, *The Unity of Nature*, published in 1884. The three works maintain, in the main, a continuous line of thought. The last applies the reasonings and conclusions of the earlier volumes, especially the great conception of Natural Law, to the subject of religion and for the construction of a philosophy of the Christian faith. It is a worthy completion of the author's endeavor to exhibit the harmonies of cosmic law and the spiritual constitution of the world.

The Duke of Argyll approaches the subject both as a Christian believer and as a student of the speculative science of our times. He has thought independently, but with evident care and in fairly conservative temper. While he has sought to give frank and full recognition to whatever truth the progress of modern science and thought have really established, he does not permit himself or his readers to forget the great ineradicable spiritual features and realities in the constitution of things, which a one-sided scientism, of the materialistic sort, has sought to deny or at least tends to obscure. His style is clear and direct. The work, though cast into the mould of a philosophy, may properly be classed as apologetic. Its appearance reminds us of the gratifying fact

that so many of the men who occupy most conspicuous rank in British public life find time and inclination to pursue these great themes, and, amid the unrest of our times, use their pens for the defence of theistic and Christian truth.

In exhibiting the philosophy of belief, the author begins in the sphere of natural religion, which he designates by the term "intuitive theology." And the fundamental fact which he points out as the one that must underlie our whole view of the ground of religious belief, is that the human mind, spontaneously and by necessity, directly recognizes the presence and acting of mind in nature as everywhere marked by movement and activity directed to rational ends. As truly and as necessarily as man is sure of mind within him, he is sure of Mind in nature about him—a Mind not himself. And this conviction of the existence of Mind as the cause of the order and purposiveness in the natural world, does not come or stand as an "inference" or conclusion from an "argument," but as an immediate perception, as fully and directly "intuitive," so that the conviction is universal and unavoidable. "The universal presence and power of mind in Nature, which has been well called in one word its purposiveness, is not a mere inference, or the result of any conscious reasoning, but is a fact apprehended by direct, immediate and self-evident perception; so much so that the perpetual acknowledgment and expression of it cannot be escaped in describing natural phenomena, even by those who are most desirous of avoiding or suppressing it." "It is part of its direct contents," he further says, "that this universal mind is—to employ the strong old English word—the Maker of the world, and of ourselves as part of it. But it does not, with the same directness, tell us anything of any characteristics of that mind, nor of any of its relations to our own, other than those of constructive origin and authorship." The chapters on this "intuitive theology" trace in a fine and impressive way from both literature and science, how universally, deeply and necessarily this fact of "purposiveness" has been incorporated in the forms of language and description of the structures and functions of life. The true and necessary philosophy of nature must be theistic.

Two chapters are devoted to the Theology of the Hebrews. One of them traces out the Old Testament conception of the Godhead. This conception views Jehovah as 'the universal God, whom we must think of as a Person, as the Creator of all things, whose will constitutes what we call the Laws of Nature, and whose law is truth and whose government is perfect righteousness.' The other chapter draws out the Old Testament view of man, as created in the 'image of God,' which has since been much defaced but not irretrievably lost, as normally capable of seeing truth and duty, and, under training of divine grace, rising into fellowship with God and righteousness.

The chapters on distinctively Christian Theology and on Christian Belief in its Relation to Philosophy exhibit, in instructive and suggestive way, how deeply the Christian system is integrated in the natural constitution of the world, and all its great verities and requirements harmonize with the principles of reason and natural law. Even in the great spiritual realities of faith and regeneration, the author finds no rupture with natural law, but spiritual movements which take place through the mental and moral faculties that belong to man's nature. "Nothing can be more striking than the complete and uniform assumption of St. Paul, that all the great conceptions of Christian theology are not only intelligible, but are in a special and structural harmony with the highest faculties of our nature. It is the custom of the sacred writers, and of St. Paul especially, to connect every doctrine of spiritual truth, or every exhortation on the conduct of life, with some general principle or law lying deep in the very nature of things."

This integration of all spiritual realities, truths and life into the unity of Nature and their essential harmony under the reign of law and the relation of means and ends, forms the fundamental idea in the author's philosophy of Christian belief.

We feel obliged to interpose objection to one position which mars this otherwise quickening and helpful work and impairs its consistency and value. On the very first page the author, following the example of some other prominent writers, condemns and repudiates the distinction between "the Natural and Supernatural." He repeats the repudiation at different points of the discussion and at its close. He does not make clear what conception he means to put in place of the rejected distinction. He says it is no question of opinion, but purely of "definition." And when he undertakes to define, he makes Nature a "name for the sum of all existence, visible and invisible, including not only the mind of man with all its works, but also whatever other and higher Mind there may be, of which he is only an emanation or a fragment." He accepts Huxley's statement: "The term Nature covers the totality of that which is." Of course he may well say: "This definition reduces the word 'supernatural' to nonsense." But is not the nonsense in the definition, which thus neglects the essential distinction between God as the self-existent Creator, and all other existences as originated and dependent? Do both belong to "nature" in the same sense? To reduce God, the "higher Mind" which the human mind recognizes as the Author of the purposes and laws incorporated in the world, to the common undistinguished and undistinguishable category of Nature, is utterly unscientific except upon the assumed basis of pantheism. But the discussion is not conducted upon the conception of pantheism—as it is not on the basis of materialism. Its Theism is purely Christian, viewing God as self-existent, personal, the Author of nature, transcendent, and yet immanent in it. And the question of the legitimacy and correctness of

the distinction between "natural" and "supernatural" is simply the question whether or not Christianity, as a *redemptive* religion, for recovery of men from sin and sinfulness, has involved any divine action in time and the world other or beyond the occurrences produced by the forces and laws placed in the world's constitution and human life simply in the creative act or process. Does Christianity carry and exhibit nothing but the natural undisturbed ongoing and development of the powers and laws set in human nature at the start? Does Christianity's divine work of redemption—God, in his eternal freedom, power, and love, in the way of affording rescue and help to lost and erring children—mean nothing more than simply letting them alone under the powers and laws that inherently belong to evolving humanity? Do not the Christian Scriptures bring us any revelation from God in excess of that from the simple human ability to make discovery of him through reading natural phenomena and laws? Is there no predictive prophecy in the Old or New Testament other than that of mere human foresight? Was the incarnation of the Son of God a merely natural event, or Jesus Christ only a product of human and cosmic forces? This denial of the distinction between nature and the supernatural, however well meant, is no little harmless matter of mere 'definition,' but strikes down inevitably against a vital reality in the claim and character of Christianity. It is to be regretted that the Duke of Argyll, who is otherwise doing such able and conspicuous service for Christian truth, has marred this valuable work by unfitting introduction of it here. We say 'unfitting'; for the repudiation does not fit the essential representations and 'philosophy' of the work itself. Again and again, in its examination of both the Hebrew and Christian teachings, it presents interpretations and views which, in spite of the repudiation, necessarily and fully involve and confess the 'supernatural' in the sense in which scientific theology uses the term. This manifest inconsistency and the utter failure of the discussion to sustain the denial of the distinction will largely save from the misleading influence of having made it. And the work will prove a valuable and helpful contribution to the discussion of the philosophy of religion.

M. V.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Threshold Covenant, or The Beginning of Religious Rites. By H. Clay Trumbull, author of "The Blood Covenant," "Studies in Oriental Life," etc. pp. 335. \$2 00 net.

Dr. Trumbull, the accomplished editor of the *Sunday School Times*, has given to the public another monument of his tireless energy and prodigious learning. Taking up an original subject, the threshold as the primitive altar upon which blood was shed as the medium of a covenant with God or with one's fellowmen, he has penetrated into some long-forgotten secrets respecting the sanctity of the threshold alike in home and in temple, in marriage customs and in religious rites, and has

brought forth, from this hitherto untrodden realm, results of the most interesting character, and of great importance, often, in the elucidation of Holy Writ.

The volume is a companion to Dr. Trumbull's "Blood Covenant," having, indeed, grown out of that, and, looking back to a still earlier date, it traces the primitive rites and religions, by which man evidenced a belief in the possibility of covenant relations between God and man, and showed, by the same sacred forms, his estimate of the sanctity of man's relation to man.

The course followed by religious observances from their first beginnings has a lesson for modern thought which it would have been well for the author to have emphasized. The earlier cult was not only the simpler but the purer cult, expressive of holy instincts and lofty impulses, forming the basis of noble religious conceptions, but gradually deteriorating into the most revolting and debasing orgies, vile perversions of the original simple rite. Whatever may be the case in other domains, there is no proof that in natural religions we find the "Survival of the Fittest."

The treatment of phallic worship and allied subjects Dr. T. has considerably relegated to a Latin Appendix, but hints are scattered through the body of the work showing how closely and how sacredly the ancients associated the factors of reproduction with the deity. He even holds that when the Bible narrative was first written, the terms "tree," "fruit of the tree," "knowledge," &c., were familiar figures of speech, or euphemisms, relating to carnal intercourse—"an untimely partaking of the fruit of the forbidden tree." "It was not until the dull prosaic literalism of the Western mind obscured the meaning of Oriental figures of speech that there was any general doubt as to what was affirmed in the Bible story of the first temptation and disobedience."

The work is not one for popular reading but for students of primitive life and culture. Its general accuracy and scientific value are vouched for by such authorities as Hilprecht, Max Müller, Sayce, Cheyne, Fritz Hommel and others. Its copious Index adds immensely to the convenience of its use. It is a volume to which scholars will often need to refer.

E. J. W.

A History of the Hebrew People, from the Settlement in Canaan to the Division of the Kingdom. By Charles Foster Kent, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Biblical Literature and History, Brown University. With Maps and Plans. pp. 220. \$1.25.

The reviewer very much regrets that he has not had time to complete the examination of what he discovered to be a fresh and delightful volume. The author writes, it is hardly necessary to say, from the modern point of view, but the results yielded to scholarly research into the Old Testament are accepted not for destructive purposes, but made to

contribute to the acquisition of the whole instead of partial truth. "In reconstructing the facts of Hebrew history in the light of modern biblical research, positive rather than negative results command attention." In pursuit of this method the history of the Hebrew people becomes living and real. "Its heroes seem at home in their surroundings. They command our admiration not because they were perfect, but because, laboring under all the limitations of their age, they were struggling, though afar, toward perfection." This is probably the secret of the charm with which readers will find the work invested, though the chief satisfaction to students must be the solution of perplexing problems by the historical perspective into which they are brought. So too "the evidence of a progressive development running through Israel's history brings it into closer relations with all history and with the universe, where God's law of progress is dominant."

Devout students, fortified by personal religious faith, and familiar with right methods of historical and literary study, will find this work not only very stimulating but, we believe, highly profitable. E. J. W.

SHERMAN AND CO., PHILADELPHIA.

Euchologion. The First Part of a Book of Common Order: Forms of Prayer by the Church Service Society of the Church of Scotland. To which is added a Psalter. pp. 142, 112. 25 cts.

The resolve of the writer formed some years since to examine every order of public worship that might appear, he finds to be a considerable contract. With Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians, the churches formerly opposed to prescribed forms, bringing out Liturgy after Liturgy, it keeps one busy to follow up and examine all these publications.

The work now in hand is of Presbyterian origin, prepared by a Society of The Church of Scotland, representing seventy of its eighty-four Presbyteries, and evidently, as shown by its reprint, as well as by slight changes adapting it to our country, intended for use by churches of the same faith in America.

The Presbyterian cast is strongly marked by the long prayers provided for both Morning and Evening Service. Both Services have two forms of prayer to be used, one immediately after the Introit, and one just before the sermon, each very much longer than the General Prayer contained in the Common Service. Happily these long prayers are broken up into parts, the first one under the headings of Invocation, Confession, Pardon and Peace, Supplications, and the second one under the headings of Intercessions, Thanksgiving, Illumination, the congregational Amen, said or sung, punctuating each part.

The much praying however, does not lessen the measure of praise. The Morning Order provides besides antiphonal versicles, and The Salutation, the *Gloria Patri*, the *Te Deum*, the *Benedictus*, besides other Hymns

or Psalms. The Evening Order has the *Magnificat*, *Nunc Dimittis*, besides versicles, and three other hymns or Psalms.

A Lesson is directed to be read from the Old Testament, as well as one from the New, but the Creed does not follow in its proper place immediately after the Scriptures, *The Benedictus* intervening in the morning, *The Nunc Dimittis* in the evening, and to our amazement the rubric reads that the Creed "may be sung or said by the Minister and people standing." The Sermon is to conclude with an ascription of praise, which can hardly vie in appropriateness with the votum of the Lutheran Service: "The peace of God which passes all understanding," &c. The "Offering" is collected after the Sermon.

While the order remains the same, the substance of the prayers for five Sundays of the month changes somewhat, the interests of variety being thus provided for, as is also the need for special prayers. A selection from the Psalms and other Scriptures for responsive reading is appended, and the Psalms are read, as they should be, not verse about, but according to the rhythm of the thought, the response of the congregation being always the latter part of the verse.

We miss the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which, besides the ignoring of the Church Year, is the only part of the historic Service that is wanting, and, to be candid, we must pronounce the sequence of parts un-historic, as for example, the General Prayer before the Sermon. We believe that the Church Service Society would have profited by the examination of the Lutheran Service, but we cannot withhold our admiration from a manual, which offers so excellent a change from the proverbial unattractiveness and baldness of Presbyterian worship, and the use of which is likely to become as extended in this country as it is already in the Scottish Parish Churches.

E. J. W.

MACMILLAN COMPANY, 66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation. By Robert L. Ottley, M. A. Two vols. Price \$3.50.

We can scarcely speak of these two splendid volumes, without seeming to intrude our private rapture, in perusing them, upon what ought to be the dispassionate service of the critic, in so grave a discussion as that undertaken by this author—the fact of the Incarnation, its scriptural presentation, and the history of the dogma down to the present time. Mr. Ottley has written primarily for theological students, and, wisely, on the central theme of gospel truth, on which the minds of theological students, in our day, must be profoundly and devoutly exercised.

On the opening page of Part 1st, we find the key note to the author's conception of his subject, in the answer he gives to the question, What is Christianity? "The simple answer is, that in its essence it is not an idea, nor a particular view of life, nor a speculation, but a fact,

a unique phenomenon." Coming to discuss the scriptural presentation of the doctrine of the Incarnation the author finds it everywhere witnessed in the Old and New Testament Scriptures, in the Hebrew conception of the divine immanence, in the yearning for the Messiah, in the Christology of the apostles, and above all in the theology of St. John. To the minds of all those in immediate contact with our Lord, and those following after, there was but one conception of his person—he was God manifest in the flesh, he was the divine assuming human nature, the image of the Invisible moving before the eyes of men. It was a stupendous mystery, but to those who saw him, and wrote about him, and to those who afterward drew the mystery into the endless toils of their speculative mystification, he could never be anything less than that—God coming to men in a way altogether unique.

There has, indeed, been no time in the history of the Church when the fact has not been called in question, and when on the one hand its magnitude has not been so far etherealized as to stultify the exceeding human realism of the account we have of it, or on the other side, so contracted and thinned out, as to be in no proper sense an incarnation at all. And what makes this long history of the dogma so interesting, despite the maze of schismatic wrangling and learned folly that besets it, is that John's simple *logos* conception of Jesus is constantly reasserting itself, and clinging all along, in triumph to the very heart of our Christian beliefs.

Two things we most cordially commend in Mr. Ottley's work, his comprehensive grasp and mastery of the subject, and the attractive manner in which he has set it forth. All scholarly resources bearing on his theme are freely, and even sumptuously at his command, and his method seems to be, to get at the heart of the contending systems of thought as they spring up along the ages,—“the soul of truth in things false,”—and then give it such chaste and finished expression as the inherently lofty nature of the discussion would require. The literary quality of these volumes is in marked contrast with the traditional form in which learned theological disquisitions are wont to be put forth—there is no heaviness, no monastic intrusion of the mediaeval gown of serge. There is in our own time a growing circle of great writers on these special themes, who have thought to help their deeper insights into a wider circle of interest by having a painstaking reference to the manner in which they write, and in these Mr. Ottley is deeply read, and among them takes himself a very high rank. Whenever in these discussions he recalls a happy form of words, a *curiosa felicitas*, which has fallen from the favored moment of some great writer along the lines of thinking he is traversing, those apt words he will quote, and then in a foot note indicate where they are to be found. This is an attractive way of introducing the student to the great company of recent and con-

temporary theologians, who have thought and written profoundly and powerfully on these great themes.

In this way we often meet with Dorner—that chief among them all—and Pfleiderer, and Westcott, and Illingworth, and Luthardt, and Bruce, and Martineau, and Newman, and Hutton, and Fairbairn, and Caird, and Harnack, and Delitzsch, and Dale, and Newman Smith, and Martensen, and a host of others, with whom in our day it were a shame not to be acquainted. Their views vary, and some may have gone widely astray, but they have all attempted the rehabilitating of this central and vital dogma of the Christian faith.

The Lutheran theologian, whose right to this region fairly antedates all others, will not fail to turn to the chapter, in the second volume, on the "*Christology of the Lutheran Church*," and elsewhere, *e. g.* on p. 271, where Luther's distinguishing doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* is discussed. It was Luther's conception of the person of Christ, and not, as he supposed, his much bruited doctrine of justification by faith, that gave his system its "Christocentric" character from the beginning. This is made to appear in Dr. Dorner's great classic on the *Person of Christ*, to which Mr. Ottley, meaning in this chapter to give but the briefest statement, constantly appeals. Mr. Ottley has not, therefore, missed the order of development of this doctrine in Luther's mind, namely, that at first, while under the warm inspiration of the *Deutsch Theologie* (1516), his notions of the incarnate and glorified person of our Lord were at their highest, but that afterward "the fair and beautiful dogma" was tarnished and travestied, when he allowed himself to carry his priceless treasure down into the dust and din of that sacramental controversy, which, from that day to this, has not ceased to disturb and divide the Church.

The matter simply hinted at by Mr. Ottley, is developed in detail by Dorner, showing definitely and historically, that Luther's christological ideas were diverted and perverted, by being thrown into the whirlpool of religious controversy, and specifically that the christology of the *Form of Concord* is at fault. As much is asserted by Mr. Ottley, when he says concerning the Giessen and Tübingen schools of battle-scarred champions over this doctrine: "Both schools made the fundamental mistake of substituting *a priori* argument for devout study of the scriptural image of Christ" (vol. II., p. 231)—that is, as I conceive, they erred in the very act of controversy on such a subject—they and Luther ought to have left it where Luther, in his primitive enlightenment, was made the favored instrument of its discovery, in "the devout study of the scriptural image of Christ."

I had almost said, that it is this pristine Lutheran conception of the incarnate person of Christ, that is the guiding star of Mr. Ottley's discussion throughout these magnificent volumes, and that our theological schools cannot do better than to appropriate the rich product as their

own. If it be objected that this high view of the incarnate and glorified person of our Lord has, as a matter of history, lent itself freely to a species of æstheticism in churchly ceremonialism, and, specifically, to the sacramental mysticism that has distracted and enervated the spiritual energies of God's people wherever it has prevailed, we may answer, with Dr. Dorner, that history has admonished us against that application of the dogma, as its diversion and perversion, as inducing a sacerdotal blight, under which 'things highest into most disastrous ruin come.' Mr. Ottley has seized the subject in the devout study of the scriptural image of it, and with a characteristic fairness and hospitality of mind, has contented himself with but one simple mention of the sacramental principle, and there he lets it rest.

W. H. W.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE CO., NEW YORK.

The Lutheran Commentary. Vols. V, VI, VII and IX, as follows:

Vol. V. Annotations on the Gospel according to St. John. By Professor A. Spaeth, D. D. pp. xlv, 351.

Vol. VI. Annotations on the Acts of the Apostles. By Professor F. W. Stellhorn. pp. ix, 420.

Vol. VII. Annotations on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans and 1 Corinthians, Chaps. i-vi. By Professor Henry E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. pp. 403.

Vol. IX. Annotations on the Epistles of Paul to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians. By Edward T. Horn, D. D., and Professor A. G. Voigt, D. D. pp. 361.

These four volumes of the Lutheran Commentary, now in course of publication by the Christian Literature Company, constitute a most important part of the eleven that will make up the whole set. They fully justify the sub-title given to the series, viz., "A Plain Exposition of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament." The comments are characterized by an admirable and, we may say, exceptional clearness, making the books treated "plain" not merely to the preacher but even to the average layman. This has been accomplished, too, without making the commentaries less scholarly because so plain. The authors have accomplished what most theological writers would like to do but not many succeed in doing, *i. e.*, to write in a way that will interest the general reader without repelling him with terms technical to theology and phrases unfamiliar to the lay mind, and at the same time to avoid the fault chargeable to so many popular theological writers of cheapening theology by watering it. These comments, though plain, are real *expositions* that show scholarship. There is a comprehensiveness, too, rather remarkable when we consider the space allowed each volume.

The forty-two pages of Dr. Spaeth's "Prolegomena" are themselves worth far more than the price of the whole volume, and the Church

will freely acknowledge its debt to Dr. Jacobs for the excellent English dress he has given to Luther's Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans. To all, indeed, will cheerfully be accorded the verdict of work well done in these commentaries.

It is a matter of gratification that the reduced price of \$1.50 per volume continues till further notice and that each present subscriber will be given one volume free for each new subscriber sent to be publishers.

FLOOD AND VINCENT, MEADVILLE, PA.

The Growth of the French Nation. By George B. Adams, Professor of History in Yale University. pp. 350. Illustrated.

French Traits. By W. C. Brownell. pp. 316.

A Study of the Sky. A Popular Astronomy. By Professor Herbert A. Howe, Director of the Chamberlin Observatory, University of Denver. pp. 340.

A Survey of Greek Civilization. By Professor J. P. Mahaffy, of Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland. pp. 340.

A History of Greek Art. By Professor Frank B. Tarbell, of the University of Chicago. pp. 295.

Professor Adams traces the growth of the French nation from the scattered elements of the feudal system into the centralized and unified state of to-day. Of course, in a compass so small, he has given only the salient features of the evolution and consolidation of this interesting people, but he has done this so well that the reader will get as clear and comprehensive view as many a larger work will give. The history is brought down to the present day.

In the second volume we name, Mr. Brownell, a cultured American who enjoyed several years of residence in France, portrays the most conspicuous traits of the French people in a series of charming essays, valuable alike for their subject-matter and their literary quality. He gives evidence of close observation and just discrimination as he writes of their social instinct, morality, intelligence, sense and sentiment, manners, women, the art instinct, their provincial spirit, and the democracy of the people. His last chapter, entitled "New York After Paris," gives in fine colors the peculiarities of our metropolis in contrast with Paris, with the odds largely in favor of the French capital.

A work on Astronomy usually repels by its technical and mathematical features, and finds few that will take up the study from pure choice. Here we have "A Study of the Sky" presented in popular form, which, with the aid of a hundred practical illustrations, gives quite a satisfactory outline of the science of Astronomy. Concrete material is used in such an abundance as to obviate the necessity, in great measure, of the technical and abstract. The book is up to date, giving us the latest investigations and discoveries and the best results of celestial photography.

Little need be said of Professor Mahaffy's qualifications to write of

Greek civilization. He is known the world over as a writer who has delightfully popularized the literature, social life, and educational methods of the Greeks. Here he has used all his best powers in giving a clear and interesting picture of Hellenic civilization. It is a book that will have a fascination for any intelligent reader, but above all for the student pursuing the study of the Greek language.

All of the books named at the head of this notice are well illustrated except the one on French Traits, but those on Greek Art, by Professor Tarbell, and Astronomy, by Professor Howe, surpass in the number and excellence of their illustrations. In the former we have two hundred reproductions of Greek architecture, sculpture, and painting; and with their aid Professor Tarbell gives a clear and comprehensive outline of the expression which Greek genius found in various artistic forms. It is worth far more than the price of the book to enjoy the pleasure of simply looking at these pictures.

These five books are written by men qualified in every way for their subjects. They constitute the required literature of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle for the year 1896-97. They are well printed and attractively bound in brown grain cloth artistically stamped. They constitute a course of reading unsurpassed in excellence by that of any preceding year. The price is very reasonable—\$1.00 each.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

Beulah Land. By Theodore L. Cuyler, D. D.

The part of the Pilgrims' Progress that brings the Pilgrims near the close of their journey to the Land of Beulah has suggested to Dr. Cuyler the title for his book. It is addressed throughout to those who are nearing the "bound of life," to those who have almost rounded out a full three score years and ten, or perhaps even more. This is not often a cheerful, sunshiny period, but too often the gloom of melancholy broods over it, yet Dr. Cuyler has come with a wand to dispel all clouds and darkness and to flood this evening time of life with sunshine. Each chapter is filled, not with the spirit of submission and resignation, but with the spirit of energy and interest in the world's movements. He proves most conclusively that the heart may stay young and the mind vigorous no matter how well silvered the locks are. And, too, that notwithstanding the demand for young men, it is the advice and counsel of the men advanced in years and experience that are sought when important questions are at stake. In fact he clearly shows how charming old age may be, how like to the beautiful sunset of a clear day it may become, and how it may be the very best part of life. We are sure that it is because Dr. Cuyler's own life is such a strikingly beautiful illustration of his arguments that they carry so much weight with them. This book is filled with genuine heart-to-heart talks from one who has by his earnest, thoughtful, sympathetic sermons and writings won the re-

gard and affection of perhaps more persons than has any other American minister, and they will fire with new courage the heart of many readers no longer young.

Sweetheart. By Ernest Gilmore.

A most beautiful story, illustrating the truth, "And a little child shall lead them." The child, in this instance, was an orphan who found her way into the home of a man whom disappointments and cares had soured, who cared not for his neighbor but lived a selfish, unlovely life. How this little "Sweetheart" brought peace and joy into his heart and home, how she wrought a revolution in his life, and how she led him to the pursuit of all that is best in life, is most touchingly told. Older persons will be benefited by it as they detect in themselves qualities of heart here made conspicuous, and children will be stimulated to imitate the lovely example of the pure and unselfish little heroine of this tale. Her sunny disposition will prove itself very winning to them and they must be incited to cultivate a similar one in themselves. So it will not fail of its purpose.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

The American Series of Drawing Books.

We are very much pleased with this series as well as with the books which represent the preparatory steps to it. The series includes twenty-seven numbers, and is arranged with great care and neatness. The lessons progress so skilfully that it seems any pupil without the aid of a teacher might make very decided strides in drawing. Beginning with straight lines and angles they pass on to geometrical figures, on to flowers, fruit, faces, and then to landscapes. The system of dots employed is an excellent one. While the books may be used alone, much greater benefit will of course be gained where they are used under the direction of a teacher, and we have no question but that this series will meet with the hearty approval of those who are instructors in the art of drawing.

HARPER AND BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

With My Neighbors. By Margaret E. Sangster.

It was at the suggestion of many readers that the papers which appeared first in leading weeklies were gathered together and published in this very attractive book. They cover a wide range of subjects and reveal throughout a sincere desire to relieve and comfort, to counsel and cheer, to lift up and in every manner help those who in any way are conscious of needing direction or sympathy. Parents and children who read these talks must gain many valuable hints for making happy lives in happy homes; we know of no one who so thoroughly understands the writing on ideal domestic life as does Mrs. Sangster. She has here discussed every phase of home-life and never once does she under-

value the importance of a broader life than that confined within the walls of home. She has also touched upon school-life; society; the servant problem; dress; ways in which women may earn a livelihood; and scores of other subjects are treated in her very best style.

We would speed on its way this hopeful, helpful book, knowing that into the homes it goes it will bring messages that will gladden and brighten the hearts about the hearthstones.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Historic Episcopate: A Study of Anglican Claims and Methodist Orders. By R. J. Cooke, D. D. pp. 224.

The overture of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in 1886, proposing a basis of union with other Protestant Churches, and of the Lambeth Conference of English Bishops, two years later, contained four conditions of such union, the fourth one being the acceptance of the "Historic Episcopate." This overture has called forth many answers both from individuals and church conventions. This is an answer from a Methodist who has given the matter careful investigation. He is led by his study not only to question the validity of the historic episcopate in the Church of England, but even to declare its actual nullity. In his sixth chapter will be found his evidence and argument on this point. The very grounds on which the Anglicans rule out other Protestants will rule themselves out, and the same arguments they use in behalf of themselves will also include the others. He gives (p. 122) Francis Mason's answer to a Romanist, and then asks: "If Cranmer, on Mason's reasoning, was in the succession, was not Luther, and Bucer, and Zwingle, and Calvin, and Knox, and all the leaders of the Presbyterians and their successors?" To those who are disposed to examine this figment, so earnestly insisted upon as a condition of union among Protestants, this book will prove very interesting if not convincing.

The Creed and Prayer. By J. Wesley Johnston, D. D. Introduction by William V. Kelley, D. D. pp. 284.

Here are twenty-one sermons delivered on twenty-one Sunday evenings by Dr. Johnston in his church in Brooklyn, N. Y. He claims that it is the only volume of sermons on the Apostles' Creed and Lord's Prayer, thus far published under Methodist auspices. He finds gratification in the fact that "its appearance is coincident with the action of our General Conference, which enjoins the use of the Apostles' Creed in our regular Sabbath services," and says that it "falls in opportunely with the present desire of the Church in giving prominence to these sacred formulæ of profession and supplication, the one authoritative with the command of Christ, the other venerable with the consensus and hallowed by the worship of the saints through many Christian centuries." It certainly is something unusual for a Methodist minister to

use a number of successive Sunday evenings for the exposition of the Apostles' Creed, and we suspect he is quite right in his supposition that his is the first book of this kind in his Church. He recognizes the trend toward the enrichment of worship and the study of doctrine, and gives his hearty approval. On one page he says, "Doctrines, creeds, and catechetical instruction are indispensable for making intelligent and biblically educated Christians," and on another, "Churches which remand creeds and catechisms to the limbo of historical cabinets are substituting make-believe for believing." These discourses have a freshness about them and a richness of illustration that make them highly entertaining to the reader as well as useful. They constitute an excellent contribution to the literature on the two subjects treated.

Nature and Christ: A Revelation of the Unseen. Ocean Grove Summer School of Theology, 1896. By Joseph Agar Beet, D. D. pp. 184.

Associated with the summer resort is rest, diversion, entertainment—high living and plain, very plain, thinking. At some of them, however, the summer school has found a welcome, and pretty solid thinking goes on with helpful recreation and recuperation. Here are some lectures delivered at Ocean Grove the past summer. They are on theological themes and hence not light and easy. The average sea-shore visitor would not find them attractive. But they were delivered at a Summer School of Theology, and we venture the statement that they were just as entertaining as instructive to the select class of hearers enrolled in that school. The author is Professor of Systematic Theology in Wesleyan College, Richmond, England. The subjects of his lectures included Religion and Theology; The Universal Revelation in Nature; The Historical Revelation in Christ; The Gospel of Pardon; The Superhuman Claims of Christ; The Supernatural Outward Attestations; The Inward Attestations; Results Attained—their Relation to the Bible, to the Church, and to the Christian Life. The first session of the school was held in 1895, but the publication of a volume containing lectures selected from the programme was not begun till this year. It is the purpose of the management to do this annually. The initial volume is a most excellent leader.

PERIODICALS.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the *Century* magazine for October is the concluding chapters of Prof. Sloane's *Life of Napoleon* which has attracted the attention of scholars all over the land and has won from them the highest encomiums of praise. A paper About French Children; Glare in the Heart of Africa and A Study of Mental Epidemics are the important papers in this issue. The second part of Amelia E. Barr's story, *Prisoners of Conscience*, appears in this num-

ber, and it is one of the strongest, one of the most thoroughly artistic, and in every sense admirable stories that has appeared for some time. On account of its dealing with the doctrine of election it is likely to excite great interest among many who care little for fiction. Sir George Tressady is also concluded in this number, as is W. D. Howells' *An Open-Eyed Conspiracy*. A serial soon to appear in the *Century* will come from the pen of Dr. Weir Mitchell, and it promises to be one of very unusual interest.

The Atlantic Monthly for October contains discussions of many important and timely subjects, among them: The Political Menace of the Discontented; The Imperiled Dignity of Science; and The Law and Girls in a Factory Village. One of the most notable articles of the year appears in this number—Five American Contributions to Civilization. Sunday in New Netherlands and New York; Margaret Fuller in a New Aspect; The Fate of the Coliseum and "Tis Sixty Years Since" at Harvard, are all excellent papers by well known contributors. The fiction of this number is exceptionally bright and a paper in her usually fine style comes from Agnes Repplier. The *Comments on New Books* and *The Contributors Club* are full of helpful hints in the selection of books and of entertainment.

St. Nicholas for October is full of bright stories, poems, puzzles and pictures. Indeed the editors seem to have thought that because vacation was ended, it should therefore not be all work for their readers, and so they have filled their magazine this month with what was specially calculated to please their youthful readers. Ogres and Goblins and the always fascinating dwellers in Fairy-land are here to greet their friends. It is enough to say that among the contributors to this number are Tudor Jenks, Laura E. Richards, Ruth McEnery Stuart, Isabel F. Hapgood, Noah Brooks and William O. Stoddard. A story of the time of Shakespere will be the leading serial for the new volume of *St. Nicholas*. It will be begun in the November number.

The October issue of *Table Talk* contains an article on "The Foods of Some of the North American People." This issue contains an article on Hallowe'en and its entertainments that will be particularly welcome. A paper on "Childlife in Japan" and another of the "Friends in Council" series are interesting. Dainty English Desserts; Creole Recipes; Housekeepers' Inquiries and the always acceptable Menus for the month are perhaps the most welcome contents to the average housekeeper. A sample copy of this delightful magazine can be obtained free by writing to the *Table Talk Publishing Co.*, of Philadelphia.

use a number of successive Sunday evenings for the exposition of the Apostles' Creed, and we suspect he is quite right in his supposition that his is the first book of this kind in his Church. He recognizes the trend toward the enrichment of worship and the study of doctrine, and gives his hearty approval. On one page he says, "Doctrines, creeds, and catechetical instruction are indispensable for making intelligent and biblically educated Christians," and on another, "Churches which remand creeds and catechisms to the limbo of historical cabinets are substituting make-believe for believing." These discourses have a freshness about them and a richness of illustration that make them highly entertaining to the reader as well as useful. They constitute an excellent contribution to the literature on the two subjects treated.

Nature and Christ: A Revelation of the Unseen. Ocean Grove Summer School of Theology, 1896. By Joseph Agar Beet, D. D. pp. 184.

Associated with the summer resort is rest, diversion, entertainment—high living and plain, very plain, thinking. At some of them, however, the summer school has found a welcome, and pretty solid thinking goes on with helpful recreation and recuperation. Here are some lectures delivered at Ocean Grove the past summer. They are on theological themes and hence not light and easy. The average sea-shore visitor would not find them attractive. But they were delivered at a Summer School of Theology, and we venture the statement that they were just as entertaining as instructive to the select class of hearers enrolled in that school. The author is Professor of Systematic Theology in Wesleyan College, Richmond, England. The subjects of his lectures included Religion and Theology; The Universal Revelation in Nature; The Historical Revelation in Christ; The Gospel of Pardon; The Superhuman Claims of Christ; The Supernatural Outward Attestations; The Inward Attestations; Results Attained—their Relation to the Bible, to the Church, and to the Christian Life. The first session of the school was held in 1895, but the publication of a volume containing lectures selected from the programme was not begun till this year. It is the purpose of the management to do this annually. The initial volume is a most excellent leader.

PERIODICALS.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the *Century* magazine for October is the concluding chapters of Prof. Sloane's *Life of Napoleon* which has attracted the attention of scholars all over the land and has won from them the highest encomiums of praise. A paper About French Children; Glare in the Heart of Africa and A Study of Mental Epidemics are the important papers in this issue. The second part of Amelia E. Barr's story, *Prisoners of Conscience*, appears in this num-

ber, and it is one of the strongest, one of the most thoroughly artistic, and in every sense admirable stories that has appeared for some time. On account of its dealing with the doctrine of election it is likely to excite great interest among many who care little for fiction. Sir George Tressady is also concluded in this number, as is W. D. Howells' *An Open-Eyed Conspiracy*. A serial soon to appear in the *Century* will come from the pen of Dr. Weir Mitchell, and it promises to be one of very unusual interest.

The Atlantic Monthly for October contains discussions of many important and timely subjects, among them: *The Political Menace of the Discontented*; *The Imperiled Dignity of Science*; and *The Law and Girls in a Factory Village*. One of the most notable articles of the year appears in this number—*Five American Contributions to Civilization*. *Sunday in New Netherlands and New York*; *Margaret Fuller in a New Aspect*; *The Fate of the Coliseum* and *"Tis Sixty Years Since"* at Harvard, are all excellent papers by well known contributors. The fiction of this number is exceptionally bright and a paper in her usually fine style comes from Agnes Repplier. *The Comments on New Books* and *The Contributors Club* are full of helpful hints in the selection of books and of entertainment.

St. Nicholas for October is full of bright stories, poems, puzzles and pictures. Indeed the editors seem to have thought that because vacation was ended, it should therefore not be all work for their readers, and so they have filled their magazine this month with what was specially calculated to please their youthful readers. Ogres and Goblins and the always fascinating dwellers in Fairy-land are here to greet their friends. It is enough to say that among the contributors to this number are Tudor Jenks, Laura E. Richards, Ruth McEnery Stuart, Isabel F. Hapgood, Noah Brooks and William O. Stoddard. A story of the time of Shakespeare will be the leading serial for the new volume of *St. Nicholas*. It will be begun in the November number.

The October issue of *Table Talk* contains an article on "The Foods of Some of the North American People." This issue contains an article on *Hallowe'en* and its entertainments that will be particularly welcome. A paper on "Childlife in Japan" and another of the "Friends in Council" series are interesting. *Dainty English Desserts*; *Creole Recipes*; *Housekeepers' Inquiries* and the always acceptable *Menus* for the month are perhaps the most welcome contents to the average housekeeper. A sample copy of this delightful magazine can be obtained free by writing to the *Table Talk Publishing Co.*, of Philadelphia.

Reading Railroad

"THE ROYAL ROUTE."

NEW AND DIRECT LINE
TO AND FROM

GETTYSBURG.

Fast, Frequent and Superbly Equipped Train Service Between

NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA,

Allentown, Pottsville, Williamsport, Reading, Harrisburg and Interior Pennsylvania Points, with through connections to and from all parts of the Middle States, New England and the West.

Visitors to America's Greatest Battlefield can obtain through tickets and baggage checks, via this new and most picturesque route, at all principal stations and ticket offices throughout the country.

I. A. SWEIGARD,
General Superintendent.

C. G. HANCOCK,
Gen. Pass. Agent.

Western Maryland R. R.

Mountain Scenery Unsurpassed.

Good road bed.

Easy riding.

Well-furnished Coaches.

Courteous and obliging train hands.

21

1

elva-

bag-
s and

gent.

R.

ed.

21